National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

HEROIC ASSUMPTIONS: DIFFERENCE AND THE LANGUAGE OF LEADERSHIP

by

Kim Morouney

©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

IN
ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1995

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA TO REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA DE REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-612-01734-6

Canada

University of Alberta

LIBRARY RELEASE FORM

Name of Author: Kim Morouney

Title of Thesis: Heroic Assumptions: Difference and the Language of Leadership

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: 1995

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to leand or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

K. Morouney

School of Business and Economics
Wilfrid Laurier University
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3C5

13 Feb 95

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled *Heroic Assumptions: Difference and the Language of Leadership* submitted by Kim Morouney in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Organizational Analysis.

Dallas Cullen

Dallas Cullen, Supervisor

Linda Smircich

Linda Smircich

Rosalind Sydie

Rosalind Sydie

Barbara Townley

Barbara Townley

Leslie Oakes

Leslie Oakes

ABSTRACT

Heroic Assumptions: Difference and the Language of Leadership

This dissertation presents a critical perspective on the mainstream discourse of leadership. A critique is developed which is informed by feminist work on androcentrism in science and the social sciences and by work in Black feminist epistemology. This critique is applied to an illustrative sample of the academic literature on leadership; it is also used reflexively, to evaluate a two-phase analysis of interview data from women and minority men in leadership positions. The analysis of interview data compares an orthodox social science approach to qualitative data analysis with a discourse analytic approach based on functional grammar. This combination of approaches permits the examination of both the experiences of diverse subjects as leaders and the dynamics of power inscribed in the leadership discourse. The result is, first, the foundation of a methodology the theoretical underpinnings of which make it appropriate to study race and gender. Second, the substantive findings of the second analysis - the themes of 'positioning against' and rhetorical style - illustrate the levels, interpersonal and textual, at which difference can be theorized to reside.

CHAPTER 1 SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION, SOCIAL EXCLUSION 1
Introduction: 1
The (Social) Science of Administration 4
Leading Gender, Leading Race 6
Overview 12
CHAPTER 2 LEADING QUESTIONS 14
The Social Construction of Knowledge: The Unacknowledged 16
Leading Questions: The Contribution of Feminist Epistemology 21
Neglected Areas of Research. 22
Focus on the Public, Official, Visible, Dramatic. 23
Single Society Assumption. 27
Assumption of Gender Neutrality. 30
Methodologies and Research Situations Unable to Capture Certain Types of Information. 32
Leading Questions: The Contribution of Black Feminist Epistemology 34
Concrete Experience as a Criterion of Meaning. 36
Use of Dialogue in Assessing Knowledge Claims. 37
The Ethic of Caring. 39
Ethic of Personal Accountability. 41
Summary 43

CHAPTER 3 SUBJECT GROUP 44
Rationale 44
"Edmonton is Canada's Festival City " 45
Subject Festivals 47
Festival Structure 47
Festival Description 48
Making Contact 51
Summary 53
CHAPTER 4 FIRST THEMES 54
A Traditional Approach to Interview Data 54
Criteria 56
Specifics of the method 57
Stakeholders, Visionaries and Stages 58
Stakeholders (1): Volunteer Labour and Participative Leadership 58
Stakeholders (2): Insiders and Outsiders (Boards, Agencies, Staff) 72
Stakeholders (3): Envisioning the Artist and the Community 78
(Super)Vision 82
Stages: The Leader and Organizational Stages of Development 91
Method and Results: Evaluation of Racial and Gender Inclusiveness 95
A Personal Reflection 101

CHAPTER 5 SECOND THEMES: METHODOLOGY.....104
A Discourse Analysis of Interview Data.....106
Criteria.....115
Specifics of the method.....119
Level and unit of analysis.....119
Transcription and presentation.....122
Functional grammar as a methodological base.....126
CHAPTER 6 SECOND THEMES: ANALYSIS.....142
Do you think of yourself as a leader?.....143
Evaluation of Racial and Gender Inclusiveness..213
Second themes and the accountability of the researcher.....218
CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSIONS.....221
Development of the question.....221
First Themes: Reprise.....222
From First to Second Themes.....225
Leadership and Language Theory.....227
Implications for the Study of Leadership.....228
Implications for Management and for Management Education.....231
Extension of the Research and Refinement of the Method.....232
Coda.....233
BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 235

CHAPTER 1

SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION, SOCIAL EXCLUSION

Introduction:

There is a certain kind of hopeless anger that comes over me when I am confronted with one of those *weltanschauung* in which my role is entirely preordained and I know that my reaction is limited to two choices: submit graciously or be branded hysterical and submit anyway, without grace, because I can't change anything. It's the same kind of anger I used to feel when my ex-husband, in a jovial mood, would trap both my wrists in one of his hands and tickle me, or threaten to - after the first couple of times, I think he did it just to marvel at my reaction when I couldn't extricate myself and had to rely upon his goodness for my comfort, my sanity and my bodily integrity.

During graduate studies in the Business School, my bodily integrity wasn't threatened, but it was discussed. I'm thinking of the time we were asked, in an organizational behaviour seminar, to discuss female genital mutilation. The topic was "culture" and the other woman in the class was absent that day. I managed, after a few long minutes, to choke out that I didn't *want* to discuss female genital mutilation in an organizational behaviour class with 10 men who had mostly studied engineering. The professor started to slam together books and folders, packing up his things to leave.

A couple of weeks later, in the same class, we happened to be watching an annoying woman on a video; it was the anniversary of the Montreal massacre. The one I always thought of as "the frat boy," sitting in front of me in the darkened room, cocked his finger and shot once at the screen. That time I didn't say anything.

> And I can't say why I found my graduate education so much less congenial than even my stint in the US Navy, unless it was that at my rank in the military *everyone* was a second class citizen, and the violence was for the most part out in the open. But in spite of the fact that I still feel like I got stuck in someone else's life, I will always be grateful, in a twisted sort of way, for what I learned in the Business School: that it doesn't begin or end with the overt stuff, like the masturbator in the library, or the sports analogies I didn't get, or the prof who liked to wheel his chair so close our knees touched. That the anger really is preferable to the fear, but that laughing is what saves you. And that what I was really afraid of, and I can't say that I'm over it yet, was that they were right about the depth of the *weltanschauung* that pooled around the portraits in the second-floor hall like mysteries around the altar, and that I would never have the strength to break the grasp that bound my imagination.

Gloria Steinem, speaking in Edmonton in the spring of 1993, referred to research which had shown that for every year of higher education women's self esteem went *down*. I was overwhelmed for a moment with a rush of shock and relief: relief that there were *words* for what I had been feeling every day since 1987; shock that such a simple explanation could have eluded me for so long, simply because my experience was contradictory to public expectation. But I have had to relive that shock of recognition more than once in the intervening months, over and over, brief moments of awareness in the trance of my dissertation, before I really understood that this uneasy relation between public achievement and private doubt *is* the connection between my work on this research and my life.

I began to look at the social construction of our North American conception of leadership as a way of coming to grips with the phantasmagoric 'knowledge' by which I understood that I was not quite capable of first class work either in the real world of business or in that most pragmatic of post-graduate humanities options, organizational analysis. I had come into the business school to overcome the feeling that there was some aspect of management that escaped me, some part of the puzzle of being the one in charge which evaded my grasp - even though, no matter what I did or how little seriously I took it, I sooner or later always seemed to end up taking charge. Having a little more knowledge about management,

I was sure, would fix this problem, which I believed at heart to be one of confidence.

I did finally buy Gloria Steinem's book, and the chapter in which she mentions the higher education/low self esteem research is entitled, "A lot of learning is a dangerous thing"[1]. In the business school I quickly found that something about the MBA/MPM curriculum was detrimental to my mental health; I don't think I was the only person in the class who experienced feeling stupid all the time, but I felt alone in my inability to any longer even imagine myself in management. Deciding that the problem was the skim and scam approach of the masters level courses to the 'real' problems of management, I switched into the Ph.D.

My academic background is in languages and literature, so my explanation of what happened next occurs to me in the form of a short story and a play. Years ago I read a short story about a child, sick in bed, who knew of the passage of days through listening every morning for the postman's footsteps. But winter came and it snowed, and the snow got deeper and deeper, until one day he could no longer hear anything of the world outside. He strained and strained, against nothing, but he could hear only silence - and the story ended. Well, this is exactly what it felt like when I switched from an MPM to a Ph.D. in Business: I kept listening, but it fairly quickly got to the point where I couldn't hear anything, only the footsteps that I gradually ceased to hear were mine.

Perhaps a better example is that of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*[2]. The characters, creations of an author unknown - of course - to them, are transported bodily from one scene to the next as their lives progress, without logic or control, toward an end casually yet inescapably predetermined by the exigencies of someone else's story. The more I studied the stories told in theories of organization, the more I realized that where my role was scripted at all, it was strictly 'supporting'. And that this was so didn't even amount to

---

[1] Steinem, (1992/93:118). The first paperback edition contains an afterword by the author in which she details some of the negative reaction the book prompted. In light of the fact that, in spite of having benefitted from her talk, it took me a year and a half to get around to looking at the book, I found her discussion of the denigration of self-esteem issues very interesting.

[2] Play and screenplay by Tom Stoppard (1968).

tragedy: Hamlet was tragic; Rosencrantz, Guildenstern and I were comic relief.

It took a long time to realize that not only was there not a place for me in management, there was barely a place for me to think about myself in management. None of the studies I studied treated what I had imagined was wrong with me as a manager. In fact, I no longer even tried to imagine what might have been wrong with me as a manager because I was having a hard time imagining myself. I believe that this was so - is so - because the knowledge with which I was confronted, in which I was immersed, was knowledge in which my experience and my self were not included.

The (Social) Science of Administration

Both the philosophical exploration of the possibility - or impossibility - of "objective" knowledge and the not unrelated sociological conception of the social construction of reality have had their impact upon theorists working in organizational analysis. European researchers tend to demonstrate a more thorough familiarity with and commitment to radical and critical approaches than their North American counterparts in the management academy. However, even North American scholars are aware of post-positivist rumblings to the point where reference to the work of a certain limited body of theorists has become "de rigeur" for anyone wishing to appear, if not politically, at least intellectually "correct" - if not a critical theorist, at least not a naïve empiricist. Thus that part of the North American literature which might be embarrassed at the charge of naïveté is fairly liberally sown with references to, for example, Berger and Luckmann, Kuhn, Foucault, and, perhaps less often, Habermas, Giddens, Derrida and Rorty[3]. Whether the works cited can be said to have had substantive consequences for the mainstream management literature remains to be determined, and will be addressed in part by the critique which follows.

---

[3] Berger and Luckmann (1966), Kuhn (1962/1970), Foucault (1976, 1980a, 1980b), Habermas (1971, 1974), Giddens (1974), Derrida (1976), and Rorty (1979). Please note that none of the authors most frequently cited are women. The example of my male colleagues in the Business Ph.D. has demonstrated to me the eminent possibility that one might consider oneself a 'critical theorist' without ever having read a book written by a woman or other than a white man.

The following sections present a *selective* overview of the literature which describes the social construction of general theories of organization and which investigates the mutually constitutive and constituting relation between organizational theory and practice - especially as this relation pertains to leadership. The greater emphasis in this section is on gender bias; a discussion of the failure of this literature to confront the equally prevalent, equally important racial discrimination in the constitution of formal organization is more thoroughly developed in Chapter Two.

Common to constructionism, postmodernism and the Habermasian critique of scientism is the notion that "scientific knowledge, like all other knowledge, cannot be disinterested or politically neutral"[4]. Kuhn, for example, criticised the reconstructions of scientific practice by historians and philosophers of science - such as Popper and Lakatos - as determinedly "rationalistic;" rather than see the outcome of the history of science as always embodying the optimal solution he argued that formal theory is always based on social convention. Not only, he claimed, are the criteria of good theory reinterpreted by each community of scientists, by each historical era, by each successive scientific paradigm, but truth itself is not independent of theory[5]. Astley, expounding upon administrative science as "socially constructed truth" in - of all places - the pages of *Administrative Science Quarterly*, denied the ability of organizational analysts to discover objective facts and report them without bias. Instead, he maintained, "we actively create truth by assigning meaning to the phenomena we observe and experience"[6].

This "assignment of meaning", the infusion of "fact" with value, is evidenced in the priorizing of interests and the definition of success criteria. Keller, writing from her own experience as a woman scientist and without reference to Foucault [7], insists that this occurs through

---

[4] Hare-Mustin & Marecek (1988:456)

[5] Kuhn (1970:206)

[6] Astley (1985:509)

[7] The example of Keller resonates both with Bordo's contention that the theoretical focus on the problematic nature of knowledge *followed from* the political movements of the 60's and 70's - an intellectual parentage which is often unrecognized - (Bordo, 1991:136-137) and with Gavey's remark that some feminist writers "believe that poststructuralists are merely reiterating

social and linguistic means, and that it is precisely in the most mundane of the established practices of a science "where the truly subversive force of ideology makes itself felt"[8] . In most of the Western world, at least, this is a gendered ideology:

> The frames of reference which order the terms upon which inquiry and discussion are conducted originate with men. The subjects of sociological sentences ... are male. The sociologist is a "he." [9]

Leading Gender, Leading Race

The heightened ideological emphasis accorded the association of women with domestic and men with public activities which accompanied the increasing industrialization of Western economies through the mid-1800's[10] informs the domination by men, historically white men, of formal organizations. This domination is thus both economic and ideological: Alvesson quotes Brown as saying "...it is not only the means of economic production that become concentrated but also the means of theoretical reflection"[11]. The domination by men of organizational life is seen to extend to the imposition of "traditional 'male' standards, assumptions, rules" in the field of management[12] ; to the fusion of sex-based values in such organizational practices as recruitment, induction, and promotion [13]; to the essentially male character of "public thinking," of social and political theory including, of course, organization theory[14]. Hearn and Parkin go on to suggest that power itself is considered as "essentially male," which leads them to conclude that "[n]ot only do men dominate within organizations, but they dominate the currency by which

---

what feminists have been saying all along" (Gavey, 1989:462).

[8] Keller (1985:11)
[9] Smith (1974:10)
[10] Davis (1981)
[11] Brown (1978:376), quoted in Alvesson (1985:131)
[12] Alvesson & Billing (1992)
[13] Mills (1988:352)
[14] Hearn & Parkin (1983:220)

domination is maintained..."[15]. Considering both the organizational emphasis on rationality, which excludes the personal and emotional, and the role of organizations in reinforcing gender-specific socialization, Mills reaches a similar conclusion:

> ... sexual discrimination is not only evidenced in a number of overt organizational practices but, more significantly, is embedded in the concept of organization itself. [16]

This organizationally-based discrimination does not, of course, operate in isolation but is the result of the dialectical relation between organizations and the societal value system, each shaping and being shaped by the other. Following Clegg[17], Mills describes "reproduction rules" by which this mutual constitution and legitimation takes place. An example of such a rule is given as "the influence of managerial and organizational theories of control upon work practices"[18]. The reflection of gender bias in theories of organizational analysis can be seen as a reproduction rule as well, one which serves to legitimate male dominance in the structuring of organizations. Astley too relies on the concept of rules: his "rules of intelligibility"[19] are embedded in theoretical constructions which in turn help to create the reality they describe. He makes explicit the association of scientific inquiry with managerial control:

> ... as our concepts and theories are communicated and filter into lay discourse, they reconstitute the very reality they seek to investigate. This is particularly true in administrative science, where our theories function as instruments of managerial control ...[20]

The intersection of managerial control with race-, class- and gender-based domination creates a microculture, to use Goodenough's term, in which societal definitions of rights and responsibilities, of what is and is not considered appropriate and acceptable, reflect

---

15 Hearn & Parkin (1983:230)
16 Mills (1988:352)
17 Clegg (1981)
18 Mills (1988:363)
19 Astley (1985:498)
20 Astley (1985:506)

and reinforce differences in power. Preservation of the microculture requires the control of such critical areas as, among others, access to knowledge and skills, access to situations in which knowledge can be acquired and skills rehearsed, and the self-perception which makes "developing the skills and acquiring the comprehension seem appropriate or desirable"[21]. Goodenough goes on to note:

> Access to the cultures and subcultures in which competence must be demonstrated in order to establish eligibility for positions of privilege becomes a major matter to which social organization is geared and is at the same time a prime target for political maneuvering.[22]

The social and political struggles of women and of minority men[23] may thus be categorized as attempts to gain access to those cultures and subcultures in which competence confers privilege.

Traditional research on women in the workplace has long been "guided by the assumption that women ... would be more successful if they were able to adopt traditionally male attitudes and behavior"[24]. Expectations for the behavior appropriate to women and minority men are, however, far more powerful and complex than this naïve assumption would have one believe. Much current research points to the application in organization theory, and especially in theories of leadership, of a 'deficiency model' for women and minority men, one which defines individuals in these groups as lacking the requisite managerial characteristics routinely ascribed to men[25] or which describes their performance, "most notably their

---

21 Goodenough (1978:85)

22 Goodenough(1978:86)

23 I have heard the complaint that the wording "women and minority men", used throughout this work, strikes some people as awkward. It is, however, far more accurate than its most commonly heard alternative "women and minorities" because the latter expression makes ambiguous the status of minority women: are they "women" or "minorities"?

24 Freedman and Phillips (1988:231)

25 Schein (1973, 1975); Brenner, Tomkiewicz & Schein (1989); Brenner, Tomkiewicz & Stevens (1991)

leadership ability"[26], as deficient in comparison to that of white men[27].

These models function in a fashion analogous to that of the concept of 'cultural deprivation'; this sociological epithet, most often applied to Blacks in the U.S., manages to confuse ideological with material poverty[28]. In the organizational setting, lack of access to power and position is translated as lack of ability to assume leadership[29]. A deficiency model thus serves to reinforce stereotypes used to control dominated groups[30] and to maintain a system of 'caste' division[31]. The futility of attempts to rectify differences in power by focusing attention at the level of stereotypical attributes is addressed by Collins when she repeats the warning that "replacing negative stereotypes with ostensibly positive ones can be equally problematic if the function of stereotypes as controlling images remains unrecognized"[32].

The example of women who seem to have escaped the constraints of stereotype is illustrative in this regard. Those few women who do infiltrate the highest managerial ranks form a remarkably homogeneous group. Heilman and colleagues surmise that women managers whose performance effectiveness is emphasized are put in a different "cognitive grouping" than that of the majority of women: they are described less stereotypically and are attributed more "masculine" characteristics[33]. The authors cite a study by Sutton and Moore[34] which indicates that executives still believe only the "truly exceptional woman" can succeed in the world of business[35]. There are actually some indications that women who "make it" in male-dominated fields are exceptional: in Hennig and Jardim's early work, the authors refer to the example of the Harvard MBA program in which 20 of the 25 women students were first-born or eldest children, whose mothers were well-to-do and highly educated, and who described themselves as having an extremely close

---

26 Heilman, Block, Simon & Martell (1989:942)
27 Morrison & Von Glinow (1990)
28 Hicks & Handler (1978:316)
29 Kanter (1977)
30 King (1973); Gilkes (1981); both cited in Collins (1986:S17)
31 Gwaltney (1981:48)
32 Collins (1986:S17)
33 Heilman et al.(1989:936)
34 Sutton & Moore (1985)
35 Heilman et al.(1989:935)

relationship with their fathers. The 25 women executives upon whom Hennig and Jardim based their research were, similarly, either only children or oldest children of prosperous and well-educated families in which there were no male siblings[36]. Keller cites similar findings for female scientists[37]. There is little need to point out that the "exceptional" women in each of these accounts were virtually without exception white women, from middle- or upper-class families.

Even those white women, however, who are socially and economically privileged, who have no brothers, who enjoy a particularly close and supportive relationship with their fathers, and who are sufficiently "male-identified" as to flourish in the corporate climate, might still be at a disadvantage in relation to their male peers when it comes to perceptions of their capacity for leadership:

> "Leadership experience," for instance, was a factor emphasized in the recruitment of males but not females and, as this quality was perceived as an asset in promotion, its assumed absence in females restricted their ability to move up the organizational hierarchy.[38]
>
> Only when women are depicted as successful managers do these discrepant characterizations disappear and, even then, women are characterized as having less leadership ability than successful managers.[39]
>
> ... assumptions of progress as a result of social, legal, and organizational changes are unwarranted ... Moreover, even with the manager label firmly affixed, women apparently are thought to differ in very important ways from men and successful managers, most notably in their leadership ability ...[40]

Underscoring the need to look beyond surface differences, Moore, a feminist anthropologist, maintains that gender constructs - like, presumably, the social construction of race - are inextricably bound up with concepts of the self, autonomy and personhood. The

---

36 Hennig & Jardim (1976)
37 Keller(1985:91, n.5)
38 Mills (1988:362)
39 Heilman et al.(1989:939)
40 Heilman et al. (1989:942)

analysis of these concepts of necessity involves, in her view, considerations of moral worth and social value. She concludes:

> These are the areas of social analysis where the connections between the symbolic or cultural aspects of socal life and the social and economic conditions under which life is lived can be most clearly recognized and investigated.[41]

This "partial and imperfect relation of symbols" to social and economic realities is investigated by Paul Rabinow, in his work *Symbolic Domination*. He demonstrates that significance is found in the "concrete interdependencies between these orders as they occur in historical development"[42]. When social conditions and the cultural categories which inform them do not change at the same rate the result, according to Rabinow, is both continuity and disharmony, political hegemony and alienation. The higher rate, relative to that of white males, at which women and minority men drop out from the corporate ranks[43] illustrates the social and economic cost of the reciprocal exclusivity of organizational theory and practice; it might also demonstrate the alienation that Rabinow proposes.

This "exodus of women and Blacks from corporate America"[44] - what Hardesty and Jacobs refer to as the "burning out or dropping out" phenomenon[45] - might also be interpreted as correspondent to Scott's "everyday forms of resistance" and protest[46]. Moore makes reference to Scott's work when she notes: "what is interesting ... is the number of men - as well as women - who are now becoming involved in such strategies of resistance and withdrawal"[47]. Clegg phrases the same phenomenon in a provocative manner; discussing organizational actors "struggling to be strategic powers and authorities," he asks:

---

41 Moore (1988:41)
42 Rabinow (1975:99)
43 Morrison & Von Glinow (1990)
44 Morrison & Von Glinow (1990:201)
45 Hardesty & Jacobs (1986:5)
46 Scott (1985)
47 Moore (1988:183)

> Those who do not struggle, who are indifferent, have little efficacy: however, this should be seen not as a taken-for-granted datum but as something which is itself to be explained. From not only what blindness, what ignorance, what blinkers, but more especially what concepts, what knowledge does this indifference, this obedience, derive?[48]

In her discussion of these "formerly invisible" people, Moore also makes reference to the theory of "muted groups." As she describes them, muted groups are those silenced by structures of dominance: "if they wish to express themselves they are forced to do so through the dominant modes of expression, the dominant ideologies"[49]. Smith describes a similar interpretation of disaffection and disorientation among out-group members: in order to function effectively within the framework of, in her case, the male-dominated discipline of sociology or, by extension, the exclusive and reciprocating spheres of organization theory and practice, women or minority men must learn to "discard [their] experienced world as a source of reliable information or suggestions about the character of the world"[50]. The logic of the dominant interpretive scheme "lies elsewhere;" the out-group member "lacks the inner principle" of her or his own activity[51]. Ferguson, in her polemic against bureaucracy, quotes Samuel Beckett in an epigram which echoes this theme:

> I am walled around with their vociferations, none will ever know what I am, none will ever hear me say it. I won't say it, I can't say it, I have no language but theirs.[52]

Overview

This work explores the relation between the mainstream discourse of leadership and women and men, in positions of leadership, whose experience is excluded from that discourse. This is accomplished through close analysis of the comments of of a group of "non-

---

48 Clegg (1989:111)
49 Moore (1988:3)
50 Smith (1974:8)
51 Smith (1974:13)
52 Beckett, *The Unnamable*, quoted in Ferguson (1984:30)

traditional" leaders, women and men who direct festivals of art and culture in Alberta.

The first chapter has located this research in terms of the experience of the author and of the argument that is the founding premise of the work: that our reality is socially constructed and that this construction is accomplished in important ways through language. In order to render this potentially vast argument in a manageable form, it has been focused on my experience as a woman in a business school, on the growing acceptance of the fundaments of social construction in organizational analysis, and on the intersection of the social constructs of gender, race, and leadership.

In Chapter 2, a critique centering on sources of bias in the dominant conception of knowledge is derived from feminist analyses of science and social science and from work in Black feminist epistemology. The points of this critique are operationalized as questions which are then addressed to an illustrative sample of the managerial literature of leadership. That a bias against women and minority men is inherent in this literature is suggested.

In Chapter 3 the subject group is described and the rationale for focusing on these particular women and men is outlined.

In Chapter 4 the first phase of the analysis is presented. This analysis of interview data is based on what has come to be accepted as an orthodox social science approach, the grounded theory method first propounded by Glaser and Strauss in 1967. The critique developed in the second chapter is then applied to the methods and the results of this phase of the analysis; the failure of this analysis to satisfy the points of the critique from, first, a methodological and, consequently, a conceptual perspective is noted.

In Chapter 5 a discourse analytic method is developed and demonstrated; in Chapter 6 this method is applied in a second analysis of the interview data. Where the first phase of the analysis focused on a non-critical aggregation of content, this second phase of the analysis, based on the principles of functional grammar, looks closely and critically at the structure of the comments of the women and men interviewed. The methodology used in this analysis is explicitly constructed in accordance with the second chapter critique; the results of the analysis are also evaluated in terms of this critique.

In the seventh and final chapter, the conclusions drawn from the analyses, implications of the methods used, and future directions for research are discussed.

CHAPTER 2

LEADING QUESTIONS

> Studies of power...have generally been written for the benefit of the powerful. [53]

In the vast majority of books and articles on leadership, both in the popular press and in scholarly contributions to the literature, the assumption is implicit either that those studied are homogeneous with respect to gender and race or that gender and racial differences are inconsequential to leadership. The first assumption is problematic in view of the changing composition of the workforce within North America and of the increasing need to address international dimensions of management. The second ignores the fact that the virtual exclusion of women and of men of color from the top managerial ranks mirrors their exclusion from theories of leadership. This chapter presents a critique, derived from feminist and Afrocentric perspectives on methodology and epistemology, of the reflexive relation between theories of leadership and those who lead. Also presented are the results of an analysis, structured by this critique, of an illustrative sample of articles in the managerial literature on leadership.

A significant subset of the growing literature on women in management does consider the interaction of gender and leadership. Whether or to what extent this literature has had an impact on the mainstream leadership discourse is largely an empirical question, one which will be addressed in the present critique. But apart from the effect it does or does not have on mainstream work, the women in management literature is marred by at least two shortcomings. First, most work which concerns itself with women in management is biased toward the experience of white, Western women. As is much of the literature of feminist theory, which may be seen as contributing to the study of women in management, this literature is open to charges of ethnocentrism and of racism in its neglect of the specific concerns of women

---

[53] Janeway (1975:104)

of color [54]. The last section of "The Contribution of Feminist Epistemology" (below) looks briefly at the meaning of a "woman-centered" style of leadership for the subject who not only is gendered but who has ethnicity and who experiences, more or less consciously, a specific class situation.

Second, the extant literature on women and leadership by and large presumes the appropriateness of building upon the foundation and working within the framework of traditional studies. While the work of examining established findings for possible sexist bias is beginning to be undertaken in organizational analysis[55], research into gender and leadership for the most part must be seen as an attempt to insert the previously excluded variable of gender into the mainstream leadership discourse. It has been noted that this less radical approach "merely extends the authority" of the existing framework, and renders the experience of women - and, it may be assumed, of minority men - "an addendum" to traditional findings[56]. Bias, like any form of power, is most effective when it is most invisible; the greater problem is not in the selection of variables but is inscribed in the conceptual framework underlying traditional research. Feminist social science "is not ... about 'adding' women into the discipline, but is instead about confronting the conceptual and analytical inadequacies of disciplinary theory"[57]. The increasing diversity of the workforce, the recalcitrant nature of change in the composition of top managerial ranks, and the virtually monolithic aspect of leadership theorizing to date presage the need for an equally fundamental shift in the perspective of management research: studies of leadership, to follow Janeway's dictum on power, must be written to benefit a more broadly-based and heterogeneous group than those who lead at present.

Two caveats are necessary. First, the lengthy and disparate controversies surrounding the definition of leadership will not be entered into here. Yukl, a well-known and well-published leadership scholar, has outlined

---

[54] Important critiques in anthropology, political science and the natural sciences are Moore (1988); Davis (1981); Harding (1986b). For critical work on race in organizational analysis see Nkomo (1992); Bell, Denton and Nkomo (1993)

[55] Martin (1990); Calás, Jacobson, Jacques & Smircich (1990); Calás and Smircich (1991); Jacques (1992)

[56] Smith (1974:7)

[57] Moore (1988:4)

several aspects of this definitional struggle; following his usage, the term "leadership" here can be presumed to be interchangeable with that of managerial leadership[58]. Second, although the workings of class differences just as those of race and gender are most often obscured - in feminist theory, in the literature on women in management, and in contemporary writing on leadership - this issue will not be treated here in order that the already enormous implications of gender and race may be more sharply focused.

The Social Construction of Knowledge: The Unacknowledged

The argument that leadership is socially constructed contends that leadership theory - its implicit assumptions, its explicit and its covert imagery - must be understood as having an impact on the dynamics of the workplace. This impact reciprocates the influence of the upper ranks of management - so similar in composition to the upper reaches of the academic ranks, especially in business schools - on theories of leadership. The impetus for a critique of leadership theory occurs from the alignment of factors noted earlier: the increasing numbers of women and of men of color entering the workforce, the neglect of gender and race by mainstream theories of leadership, the virtual exclusion of women and minority men from the uppermost reaches of the managerial ranks. All of these factors, in addition, bear upon the need to address cross-cultural aspects of managerial leadership in a global economy. Before moving on to this analysis, however, it seems appropriate to briefly outline the social construction of the present critique.

Because this critique presents a challenge to the predominant mode of the social construction of knowledge and especially because its genesis is in feminist methodology and Afrocentric epistemology it might be expressed in Foucauldian terms as occurring through the "insurrection of subjugated knowledges"[59]. Foucault describes such knowledges as having remained *unacknowledged* within the corpus of functionalist theory because they have been regarded as inadequate, or as "insufficiently elaborated: naïve knowledges, located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificity"[60].

---

58 see Yukl (1989:252-253)

59 Foucault (1980b:81)

60 Foucault (1980b:82)

The identification, however, between poststructuralist theories and a feminist perspective is, for a multitude of reasons, certainly not complete. Political practice has been at least as important as theoretical criticism to the development of feminist epistemologies: in the opinion of some, it was in the liberation movements of the 60's and 70's, including women's liberation, that the critique of the objectivity of knowledge originated[61]. And it is for political reasons that Foucault's work, among the work of other prominent poststructural theorists, is alternately praised and criticized by feminist scholars. Nancy Hartsock, for example, argues that Foucault's subjugated knowledges, described as fragmentary and incomplete, are capable only of resistance to "official knowledge" and are helpless to challenge or to change that knowledge. Thus, in her view, the relegation of such oppositional discourses as feminist or Afrocentric criticism to the status of subjugated knowledges means that in the Foucauldian scheme the marginal remain marginal[62].

Within the argument for the social construction of knowledge, the critique of the social construction of science holds a privileged place: at least since the Enlightenment scientific activity has been considered the standard for rational activity. Furthermore, from the invention of gunpowder in China to the deployment of atomic power in Nagasaki and Hiroshima and through to the present government-sponsored revamping of high school science curricula in North America, superiority of scientific knowledge has most often been thought of as synonymous with political supremacy.

But that scientific knowledge is in fact the *product* of political supremacy is demonstrated in the work of Thomas Kuhn. In the work of Kuhn, who assumes perhaps a less problematic place in the development of feminist criticism than the literary poststructuralists, a critique such as the present one might be categorized as the gathering of a critical mass of anomalies sufficient to challenge the dominant paradigm[63]. Kuhn criticized the reigning views of science as the retellings of history from the perspective of the winners. By its refusal to refer to or create an absolute and independent standard by which reason, reconstituted, is triumphant, Kuhn's position admits of other interpretations of the progress of science. Keller, for example, in *Reflections on*

---

61 Bordo (1990:136)

62 Hartsock (1990:167-8)

63 Kuhn (1970)

Gender and Science, begins by acknowledging her debt to Kuhn. She follows that acknowledgement with an image which captures the social construction of scientific knowledge by the dominant group:

> Representation of the world, like the world itself, is the work of men; they describe it from their own point of view, which they confuse with the absolute truth. [64]

The work of Sandra Harding builds upon Keller's *Reflections*, extending her critique such that the "woman question" in science is transformed, as the title of her 1986 book makes clear, into "the science question" from a feminist perspective. Harding defines a feminist approach as constituting "the prerequisites for producing less partial and distorted descriptions, explanations, and understandings"[65]. She also makes note of the similarities between certain aspects of feminist and African/African-American worldviews, in particular of the overlap in their respective critiques of "Eurocentric, masculinist" epistemology, ontology and ethics[66]. A concise view of the social construction of an African-American critique can be taken from the work of John Gwaltney, an urban anthropologist. Gwaltney advocates the use of "alternate logical models derived from hitherto underrepresented, subordinate, and misrepresented cultures" to introduce the criterion of difference, and submits that such models "merit a more serious and sensitive reception before a more open and polyglot social scientific institution"[67].

* * * * * * *

Thus, the confrontation between competing aspects of feminist/Black feminist perspectives and the perspective of the management literature on leadership provides the occasion to formulate questions by which the less obvious assumptions of leadership research might be brought to light. In the following section, potential sources of androcentrism and racism in leadership research are delineated, following the models given by Millman and Kanter, by Harding, and by Collins. From each problematic supposition, questions are formulated which

---

64 de Beauvoir (1970); quoted in Keller (1985:3)
65 Harding (1987:12)
66 Harding (1986a; 1986b:163-196)
67 Gwaltney (1981:49)

operationalize the concerns of feminist and Afrocentric perspectives such that gender and racial bias implicit in the methodological assumptions of the literature of leadership might stand revealed. The ability of the mainstream literature to "respond" to these questions is illustrated through the use of an analysis of a sample of this literature on leadership. The sample[68] consists of 25 publications in major journals, spanning the years from 1986 to 1989, which are considered to represent the "trends and developments in the 1980's"[69]. The articles analysed, with a brief description of their contents, are listed in Table 1.

Table 1

Barnes & Kriger, 1986	The hidden side of leadership - field experiment
Bass et al., 1987	Transformational leadership and world leaders - lab experiment
Carroll & Gillen, 1987	Classical management functions vs. Mintzberg's managerial work
Conger & Kanungo, 1987	Behavioral theory of charismatic leadership
Cotton et al., 1988	Employee satisfaction meta-analysis without gender or race
Crouch & Yetton, 1987	Manager behavior, leadership style & performance - "semi-field"
Day & Lord, 1988	Methodological problems with succession studies

---

[68] The illustrative sample used here comprised the most recent articles cited in the most comprehensive review of the literature as of 1990. Articles included in the sample were single empirical studies or reviews of empirical work in which methodology and subject groups were explicitly described. Theoretical articles and meta-analyses were included only if they referred explicitly to methods and/or identifiable subject groups.

[69] Yukl (1989:252)

Duchon et al., 1986	Ingroup/outgroup vertical dyads not affecting performance or satisfaction
Ettling & Jago, 1988	Vroom-Yetton meets Desert Survival
Graen et al., 1986	Growth need strength & productivity among secretaries
Hammer & Turk, 1987	Organizational determinants of leadership behavior & authority among manufacturing supervisors
House et al., 1988	Charismatic & non-charismatic - differences in behavior and performance among U.S. presidents
Howell & Frost, 1989	Lab study of charismatic leadership
Komaki, 1986	Operant analysis of effective supervision
Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987	Transactional & transformational - developmental analysis on male development model
Leana, 1986	Delegation - predictors and consequences, but no gender or race
Manz & Sims, 1987	External leadership of self-managing work teams
Miller & Monge, 1986	Participation, satisfaction & productivity without gender or race
Mulder et al., 1986	Power, situation & effectiveness - French & Raven in crisis/non-crisis situations
Pfeffer & Davis-Blake, 1986	Administrative succession and performance in NBA teams
Scandura et al., 1986	Leader-member exchange & apriori measures of employee satisfaction

Thomas, 1988	Competing models of leadership & organizational performance with archival data
Vecchio, 1987	Prescriptive situational leadership theory with teachers and principals
Wagner & Gooding, 1987	Situational variables moderating participation outcomes
Waldman et al., 1987	Leadership and performance appraisals

Leading Questions: The Contribution of Feminist Epistemology

The existence of several research assumptions which reinforce the exclusion of women, and of women's concerns, from the realm of the social sciences is posited by Millman and Kanter, in an early collection of feminist writings[70]. The same problematic assumptions are taken up by Harding in her assessment of the natural sciences from a feminist viewpoint[71]. Their rendering of sources of androcentrism in research, used here to structure - in part - the problematics of gender and race in the literature on leadership, are the following: neglected areas of research; a focus on public, official, visible, dramatic; the "single society" assumption; an assumption of gender neutrality; and methods and research situations which are unable to capture certain types of information

The labelling of the preceding as *methodological* sources of androcentrism is crucial. While the contribution of Black feminist epistemology to a critique of leadership is rooted in concrete experience, as will be discussed below, the perspective of this first segment of the critique is focused more specifically on the nature of the research, on the theoretical orientation of the research methodology.

The progression from the first source of bias to the next, on to the following, and so on, is also significant. The movement from the general definition of the area of research, to the types of information that the research situation and method are able to incorporate

---

[70] Millman & Kanter (1975)

[71] Harding (1986b)

and on to, in the final section, the personal accountability of the researcher is a movement from the global to the specific; it is a movement from societal and institutional definitions to personal responsibility. The organization of the critique is such that if the first premise is violated, the rest are irrelevant; if the first holds, then the next may be examined, and so forth. The first issue centers on which areas of research are defined as relevant, and by whom.

Neglected Areas of Research.

Traditional leadership theory addresses the problems of those in power. Mainstream theories have not addressed the exclusion of women and men of minority status from leading positions in formal organizations because they have traditionally begun their analyses with the problems and concerns of the dominant group in organizations. That topics of general interest have been most often male-identified, while female-identified problems are neglected has been noted by McHugh and colleagues, in their exposition of the problem of topic selection in psychological research. As a female-identified topic, however, they provide the example of "maternal roles" while, tellingly, as a male-identified topic they offer the example "leadership"[72]. That there are aspects of the male-identified topic of leadership research which directly concern women and men of color is doubly obscured when female-identified areas of research are devalued, and when the import of ostensibly male-identified areas of research for women and minority men is disregarded. This leads to the first question that should be asked of the leadership literature.

Question 1. Are concerns of women and minority men, as leaders or as among those to be led, explicitly addressed?

None of the articles in the management sample directly addressed the concerns of women or of minority men, either in positions of leadership or as among those to be led. There exists a substantial empirical literature in the field of psychology which addresses such pertinent issues as the intersection of gender and leadership style, the interaction of gender and the emergence of leaders, and the issue of whether women are

---

[72] McHugh et al. (1986:884)

devalued in leadership roles[73]. In spite of this body of research, the mainstream management literature on leadership remains imperturbably monolithic with respect to the race and gender of its subject group. The inference might seem inescapable that, in spite of the increasing diversity of the workforce and the increasingly international scope of management, issues of race and gender differences have had negligible impact upon contemporary "trends and developments" in the management literature on leadership. It seems as likely, however, that mainstream theorists, claiming the gender- and race-neutrality of leadership theories, might argue that the concerns of women and of minority men are addressed *implicitly*. The analysis of the literature must procede, therefore, by investigating the *implicit* inclusion of women and of men of color among leaders and subordinates.

Focus on the Public, Official, Visible, Dramatic.

The symbolic division of the social world into public and private spheres and the pervasive, historical identification of those spheres with, respectively, the masculine and the feminine has been the focus of much feminist scholarship. The work of Nye, Sydie, and Spelman, to name but three out of many, comments upon the sexual - and, in the case of Spelman, the racial - division of labor as incorporated in the writings of western thinkers from Plato and Aristotle, to Hegel and Schopenhauer, to Darwin, Parsons, Marx and Weber[74]. This division of labor is not interpreted as neutral: in analyses of the representation of women[75], "orientals"[76], and Black women[77] as "the Other" as well as in the poststructuralist analyses of language[78], the construction both of the "Other" and of either/or dichotomies is revealed as premised upon the privileging of one half of the pair at the expense of the other. Public/private, European/ Oriental, white/black, culture/nature, reason/emotion, fact/opinion, mind/body, subject/object, universality/specificity - is it difficult to guess which

---

[73] References to which are collected in the meta-analyses of Eagly & Johnson (1990); Eagly & Karau (1991); Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky (1992)

[74] Nye (1988); Spelman (1988); Sydie (1987)

[75] de Beauvoir (1970)

[76] Said (1978)

[77] Collins (1990)

[78] Derrida (1976)

elements are valued and which devalued in the comparisons? Typical of a critical perspective on such binary oppositions is the comment by Hare-Mustin and Marecek that "representation of gender as opposition has its source, not in some accidental confusion of logical typing, but in the dominant group's interest in preserving the status quo"[79].

Marginalization of the concerns of the less powerful is thus the result of "representation ...as opposition"[80], of stereotyping, of what Collins refers to as "externally defined, controlling images"[81]. Even at the level of anecdote, the media portrayal of Blacks, with its attendant emphasis on the public, official, visible, and dramatic, illustrates this process. Blacks portrayed as participants in the public sphere tend to be high-profile individuals in areas sanctioned by convention: entertainers, athletes and political figures. The official attitude of the media - as of their government and corporate sponsors - toward Blacks is of equality and equal opportunity. The most visible elements of Black society are themselves subject to oppositional or dichotomous representation: high-profile "success stories," mentioned above, and violent, sexually uncontrolled, drug-addicted, ghetto youth - or, as Patricia Williams characterizes the apocalyptic image, "violent seventeen-year-old black males in running shoes and hooded sweatshirts"[82]. The most dramatic? Those who manage to incorporate both sides of the equation, success in politics, sports or entertainment *and* a brush with, if not a tragic *dénoument* through, sex, drugs or violence: from Martin Luther King, to Jimi Hendrix, to Richard Pryor, Marvin Gaye, James Brown, Mike Tyson, Magic Johnson, Marion Barry, Clarence Thomas, Michael Jackson, and O.J. Simpson. [83]

Media stereotyping is, of course, not restricted to its depiction of Blacks nor are Black media free from

---

[79] Hare-Mustin & Marecek (1988:459)

[80] Hare-Mustin & Marecek (1988:459)

[81] Collins (1990:106)

[82] Williams (1991:66)

[83] Not to mention Arsenio Hall broadcasting live from the riots in L.A. This particular media fascination appears to be decidedly male-oriented: only Billie Holliday comes to mind as a feminine example of Black celebrity brought low by sex, drugs or violence. Since Black women are depressingly often the victims of sex-crimes, drugs and violence, it must be the celebrity which is elusive.

distortion[84]. The point is that a focus on the public, official, visible and dramatic renders the concerns of the less powerful as private concerns, as "personal problems," as invisible, as mundane. A focus on "official" equality negates the existence of systemic injustice. Those whose experience is not encompassed in categories accorded high visibility or high drama are made invisible or are assimilated to a "neutral" (white or male) standard: an example of the first instance is the seldom-heard-from non-violent, non-drug-addicted, minimally employed ghetto-dweller[85]. An example of the second is given in the words of Karen Russell, daughter of the basketball athlete Bill Russell:

> How am I supposed to react to well-meaning, good, liberal white people who say things like: "You know, Karen, I don't understand what all the fuss is about. You're one of my good friends, and I never think of you as black." Implicit in such a remark is, "I think of you as white ... " [86]

The argument is made that what must be changed is the normative labelling of gender-related differences in behavior, noting that sex and its physical markers represent "socially significant symbols that are used as the basis for social differentiation"[87]; an analogous argument made with respect to race might be the valuation of stereotypically Black and formerly denigrated images - a standard of beauty based on (one of a multitude of) African physiognomies, for example, or the recent popularization, even among wealthy whites, of hip-hop street fashion. The notion implicit in such arguments, however, that gender and racial hierarchies might be subverted through reverse valuation or through some determination of context-dependent effectiveness may be seen again as helpful to the perpetuation of an unequal balance of power. As Collins notes in a discussion of a light-skinned standard of beauty among African-Americans, the replacement of one set of controlling images by another leaves intact the ideology of domination which

---

84 The criticism of Spike Lee's film portrayals of women comes to mind.

85 While perhaps not *as* neglected by the media as is the quiet ghetto-dweller, the victimization of Black women does not receive a high profile in the media and thus is rendered personal, not visible.

86 Russell (1987:22) quoted in Collins (1990:79)

87 McHugh et al. (1986:881)

employs both positive and negative stereotypes[88]. The example of the vogue for rap-inspired fashion, which has thus far left the problems of inner-city ghettos remarkably intact, is an appropriate example. Similar evidence in regard to leadership theory is the sanctioned, visible presence of managerial women in more "feminine" areas, notably personnel or training, for which their skills are deemed appropriate: the official valuation of women in such roles constitutes in fact their relegation to areas in which they exercise little real power. In order that we understand both the impediments to women's progress and the processes keeping them subordinate, Alvesson and Billing suggest that the focus of inquiry must include the less public, the less visible, the "unofficial" workings of leadership[89] . This leads to the second query:

Question 2. Is the focus of the research directed toward high-profile individuals, or are less visible, less "public" persons included?

In the sample of management literature, the focus of inquiry was split nearly evenly between studies which concentrated on the leadership behaviors and the perceptions of high-profile individuals and those which attended more closely to the perceptions and attributions of subordinates. Such studies as those of self-managing teams[90] and of leader-member exchanges[91], for example, paid explicit attention to the perspectives of subordinates. Those focusing on succession[92], on organizational determinants of behaviour[93], on classical versus Mintzberg's management principles[94], and even on "effective supervision"[95] managed to address the problems of leadership without recourse to subordinates' opinions. But where it is included, does the attention to the attributions of subordinates amount to what has been described as a "from below" perspective? A perspective "from below" might be expected to shed light on the

---

88 Collins (1990:88)
89 Alvesson & Billing (1992)
90 Manz & Sims (1987)
91 Scandura et al. (1986)
92 Day & Lord (1988)
93 Hammer & Turk (1987)
94 Carroll & Gillen (1987)
95 Komaki (1986)

dynamics of race and gender in organizations[96]. Among the articles reviewed, that of Barnes and Kriger[97] refers to the need for such a perspective in leadership research: "we need to remember that leadership, or lack of it, is usually better recognized by the so-called followers than by the formal leaders"[98].

It might be regarded as a strength of the leadership literature that such a perspective has become institutionalized in the attention given to the opinions of subordinates; such optimism would require, however, that one ignore the standardization, and perhaps reduction to ritual, inherent in the processes of institutionalization[99]. Evidence for the ceremonial nature of conformity to the expectation that the perceptions and "satisfaction" of subordinates will be addressed is witnessed in the overwhelming use of apriori instruments to tap this perspective: are subjects in fact expressing their opinions or are they "pecking keys"? Are they doing more than just ticking the boxes required by the model, a model which in most cases reflects the standard research focus on the public, official, visible, and dramatic? These questions must be related to whether or not concrete experience is explicitly made a criterion of meaning (see question 6 below).

Single Society Assumption.

The tendency to assume the applicability of concepts derived from research with white men, and of the research methods used as well, to the experience of women and minority men can be seen as a tendency to ignore or minimize difference. An example given by McHugh and colleagues of psychologically-based theory inappropriately generalized is that of achievement motivation, which is most often presented as universalistic, but which is premised wholly on the behavior of male subjects[100]. The work of Carol Gilligan,

---

96 Alvesson & Billing (1992)

97 Barnes & Kriger (1986)

98 Barnes & Kriger (1986:15-16)

99 See the classic Meyer & Rowan (1977)

100 McHugh et al. (1986:884). Although the extension of this research to Japanese society and the replication of results among Japanese men has been touted as evidence of the theory's universality (De Vos, 1973), this cannot be seen as proof of its applicability to women and minority

as a second example, specifically challenges the universality of Lawrence Kohlberg's well-accepted model of moral development - according to which most women and minority men scored as less highly morally "evolved" than most white males[101].

In accordance with the assumption of a homogeneous society, a vast popular literature has prospered by telling and re-telling women how to "act like a man." The hidden principle is that we may not be all the same but we *should* be, and you *could* be if only you would try. This same principle informs the more vast, more amorphous cultural pressure for Blacks and other minorities to assimilate to a white standard. But such models hold out false promise in several respects. They ignore the different social and economic resources to which men and women, minority and majority races, have access. They presume that "a certain manner of speaking or acting will elicit the same reaction regardless of the sex [or race] of the actor"[102]. The assimilation argument also ignores Kanter's warning about the "benefits" available for the first few out-group members - the "tokens" - who move into dominant-group territory; these same benefits will not be offered once the number of out-group representatives in formerly segregated areas is seen to increase appreciably. Those who might be seen in isolation as "pets" come as a group to be seen as potential threats[103]. Finally, even in the short term such strategies tend to enable only a very restricted group to become accepted as tokens: those women and minority men closest in class background and socialization experiences to their white male counterparts, ethnic and racial minorities whose features and skin color are closest to that of the dominant group, and women and men who are deemed - from the aesthetic standpoint of the dominant group - "attractive." This leads into the third question:

Question 3. Is the assumption made of a homogeneous subject group or are realities of race and gender included? What percentage of research subjects are women or minority men?

---

men in the U.S.; similar results among Japanese women and *burakumin* (outcast) men might be more convincing.

101 Gilligan (1982)

102 Hare-Mustin & Marecek (1988:458)

103 Kanter (1977); Keller (1985)

Nine of the 25 articles listed the percentage of subjects that were female[104]; one included the racial composition of the subjects[105]. Two of the nine used all male subjects[106]; four of those remaining had 90% or more male subjects[107]. Two groups of students were almost evenly split between males and females[108]. In an article which did not list the percentage of female subjects the subject group of secretaries was "predominantly" female[109]. One article - again, one which gave no percentage of male/female subjects - made specific reference to sex differences in its findings: finding none[110].

Amid so many articles which ignored the race and gender of their subjects there was a comment which was particularly noteworthy. After remarking that all superiors reported on were male, and that 93% of the subordinates were also male, the authors of this particular study cautioned: "the point should be noted that this male-dominated sample, typical of many industries though it may be, essentially examines males' perceptions of males and their behavior"[111]. A short comment, and rare, but one which effectively avoids the falsely universalizing discourse that begins with the assumption of a homogeneous subject.

A bar to the reporting of sex or race differences in the research literature might well be the argument, voiced by McHugh et al., that "sex- [or race-] related differences that have not been predicted by or grounded in a theoretical model may not be appropriate content for published research" [112]. Eagly, in taking issue with these views, counters that the suppression of findings

---

[104] Manz & Sims (1987); Hammer & Turk (1987); Howell & Frost (1989); Ettling & Jago (1988); Waldman, Bass & Einstein (1987); Scandura, Graen & Novak (1986); Pfeffer & Davis-Blake (1986); Leana (1986); House, Woycke & Fodor (1988)

[105] Manz & Sims (1987)

[106] Pfeffer & Davis-Blake (1986); House, Woycke & Fodor (1988)

[107] Manz & Sims (1987); Hammer & Turk (1987); Waldman et al. (1987); Scandura et al. (1986)

[108] Howell & Frost (1989); Ettling & Jago (1988)

[109] Graen, Scandura & Graen (1986)

[110] Bass, Avolio & Goodheim (1987)

[111] Scandura, Graen & Novak (1986:581)

[112] McHugh et al.(1986:883), also quoted in Eagly (1987:756)

"uncongenial or irrelevant to current theories" impairs replicability by removing the means of comparison of results, restricts the growth of new theories by ignoring contradictory and serendipitous findings, and obscures evidence of the absence of differences by eliminating reports of null findings[113]. In addition she notes that, while readers can "readily translate any statistically precise finding (i.e., reported in terms such as *t* or *F* statistics or means and standard deviations)" to any one of countless alternative metrics (effect size, binomial effect size display, percent-variance), "[v]ague reports (e.g., 'there were no significant sex differences') cannot be so translated and cannot be aggregated across studies in an informative way"[114].

A more recent article by Eagly and colleagues further emphasizes the importance of reporting, if not sex differences in the findings of the specific research question, then at least sex and race distributions among both leaders and subordinates. In their meta-analysis of the interaction of gender and the evaluation of leaders, Eagly et al. found that women in leadership positions were devalued relative to male counterparts when leaders occupied male-dominated roles and when the evaluators were men[115]. The failure to report the sex and race of subjects makes it impossible to re-examine the management literature on leadership for these interactions. Not enough research exists, presumably, in the area of race and the evaluation of leaders to permit a meta-analysis of these results; the reporting of racial composition of subject and subordinate populations would allow such investigations to begin.

Assumption of Gender Neutrality.

Even when the supposition of a homogeneous society is revealed as impractical, and impracticable, the assumption perseveres that race and gender are theoretically neutral. Mills cites examples of the traditional failure of organization theory to acknowledge that gender might act as an essential variable. He refers to the Hawthorne studies, the results of which were presented as explaining behavior *in general* in spite of the fact that output was increased by the women (the "test room") and restricted by the men (the "bank wiring room"). He also notes the wide-ranging impact of the

---

[113] Eagly (1987:756)
[114] Eagly (1987:757)
[115] Eagly et al. (1992)

study of employee participation in decision-making[116] in spite of the fact that original results were not replicated in a later study by French and colleagues[117]:

> The fact that the original study was based on female workers while the replication study was based on male workers was not taken into account; unlike the females, the male subjects were less willing to accept the legitimacy of participation schemes, were more attached to group norms of restricted output and, as a result, working practices were not "improved."[118]

The fact that even an article promoting non-sexist research does not problematize the notion of leadership as a "male-identified" topic[119] indicates a historical thematic of bias in the very images and baseline conceptions of leadership. Again, the work of Eagly et al. provides evidence that studies using male subjects - of which the theoretical base for leadership is nearly entirely constructed - produce a preference for male leaders[120]. Research questions which presume no sex differences will ignore the devaluation of female leaders whose leadership style is seen as stereotypically masculine. If a research situation is presumed to be unaffected by a skewed racial or sex distribution, the disadvantage of women or minority men who are given increased salience and prominence as "tokens" will be overlooked. Thus, the fourth question:

Question 4. Is there an assumption of race- and/or gender-neutrality in the theoretical base, in the research question, in the research situation and methods? Is this assumption valid?

The assumption of neutrality is particularly evident in the unquestioned acceptance of the validity of established findings, models, and tasks. Among the most often cited (the usual suspects) were the works of Bass, Burns, Dansereau, Graen and Haga, Fiedler, French and

---

116 Coch & French (1948)
117 French, Israel & Aas (1960)
118 Mills (1988:353)
119 McHugh et al. (1986:884)
120 Eagly et al. (1992:12-13)

Raven, House, Vroom and Yetton , Weber[121]. In light of Mills' observations surrounding the neglect of gender-related differences in participation research two articles were especially noteworthy. These were two meta-analyses of participation studies, neither of which mentioned gender or race[122].

As was mentioned earlier, the critical work of examining the major findings which constitute the theoretical bases of leadership research for gender and racial bias has begun, but the acceptance of this work as part of the current leadership canon appears doubtful for the forseeable future. The deconstruction of texts and articles is one critical approach which has proven fruitful in other disciplines but which, within the confines of mainstream, quantitatively-based, managerially-oriented organizational analysis, has largely been dismissed. An illustrative example is that of Calás and Smircich's framebreaking deconstruction of excerpts from the "seminal" works of several of the forefathers of managerial leadership research. In publication, that work was effectively reframed by the patronizing and heavy-handed "humor" of a letter from Mintzberg, printed as a rejoinder immediately following the article. Whether the rejoinder was printed as a decision of the editors or of the authors was not signalled in the journal, but was, in its effect, immaterial: from the perspective of the mainstream reading audience, the last word was a dismissal.

Determination of the relative gender- and race-neutrality of the research question and situation would seem to require a detailed contextual analysis of not only the work itself but the background situation of each study. Such information is most often difficult to access. Perhaps a more direct and easily demonstrable analysis might be the critical retesting, with subjects whose socialization experiences, cultural backgrounds, sex and race are varied, of those measures which have come to be widely used. Several examples are addressed below under question 6, "apriori instruments."

Methodologies and Research Situations Unable to Capture Certain Types of Information.

---

[121] Bass (1985), Burns (1978), Dansereau, Graen and Haga (1975), Fiedler (1967), French and Raven (1959), House (1971, 1977), Vroom and Yetton (1973), Weber (1947)

[122] Miller & Monge, (986) Wagner & Gooding (987)

Hearn and Parkin offer a colorful analogy for a common flaw in research methodology: that of the police investigating themselves. "It is not that such research is invalid, but that there are omissions in its concerns"[123]. The assumptions and hypotheses which researchers bring to the research situation act, to a greater or lesser degree, as barriers to understanding and to obtaining insider information and as blinders to the harm they may inflict upon the subjects of their research[124]. Freedman and Phillips, for example, cite several studies in which differences in performance are attributed to differences in task and social orientations between males and females; leadership research tends to favor stereotypically male tasks[125] which may easily vary in salience and familiarity between women and men[126]. In their inventory of the problematics of psychological research methods, McHugh and colleagues go on to list the sex [race] of the experimenter and the sex [race] composition of the subject group and of other participants or confederates. They also highlight the choice of lab or field context, citing studies which indicate that "sex by situation interactions are more the rule than the exception, being found more frequently than main effects for sex..."[127]. This leads to the fifth question:

Question 5. Are the methods and the research situation appropriate to address the reality of women and minority men? What is the sex and race of the researcher, of the confederates? What are the implications of the research method for subjects who may lack status and/or legitimacy?

Approximately 84% of the authors in the management literature sample were men. An example of whether or not evaluation methods were always appropriate to the status of the individuals studied might be drawn from a case in which a male researcher gathered survey information from high school teachers[128]. The focus of the survey was the relation of the individual teacher to the principal. While the majority of principals are male and the

---

123 Hearn & Parkin (1983:234)
124 McHugh et al. (1986)
125 Freedman & Phillips (1988:234)
126 McHugh et al. (1986)
127 McHugh et al.(1986:885-886)
128 Vecchio (1987)

majority of teachers are female, the percentage of subjects of each sex in the two groups was not noted. And while the usual guarantees of anonymity were proffered, the principals themselves distributed the questionnaires. It was not clear who collected the completed surveys. Hearn and Parkins'[129] analogy of the police investigating themselves seems apt: the work may not be invalid, but glaring, and critical, are the "omissions in its concerns."

Critical as well are the omissions in the concerns of mainstream feminist theory. Elizabeth Spelman is just one of many recent scholars who point out the tendency in mainstream feminist theory to conflate theory grounded exclusively in the experience of white middle-class women of Western industrialized countries with common theoretical ground upon which women of different ethnicities, nationalities and classes can meet[130]. Baseline assumptions, while adjusted for gender, remain parallel with those of mainstream research: all women are basically the same, or *should* be, race and class are or should be theoretically neutral, any flaw in scientific research method can be addressed by balancing the number of researchers of each sex. The contribution of Black feminist epistemology moves the focus of research beyond the assumption of the abstract - though now gendered - individual who is the traditional subject of organizational research.

Leading Questions: The Contribution of Black Feminist Epistemology

The observation has been made that only "the most exceptional women from highly privileged class backgrounds... can get into science"[131]; this is of course equally true for those women who make it into the top ranks of management, or full professorships at universities, or highly ranked journals of management. It is not enough to note the similarities between feminist and Afrocentric concerns and to assume that a mainstream (white, middle class) feminist critique will represent, and will benefit, all women equally: to do so is to run the risk of neglecting, and through neglect help to perpetuate, racist elements of theory and practice which we presume to criticize. While there are several ethnic and racial minorities in North America

---

129 Hearn & Parkin (1983)

130 Spelman (1988:3)

131 Rose (1983:86)

whose disadvantage in the corporate world has begun to be documented[132], most of the debates about race and ethnicity in the U.S. are

> rooted in schisms between blacks and whites... In short, there is much more written about blacks than about the other groups... This means that blacks also have a longer history of thinking and writing about these issues.[133]

The literature which addresses the experiences and concerns of Blacks is the most voluminous and well-developed, and can be seen in several ways as a paradigm for a particularly North American "otherness". Thus, informing the structure of the following critique of the leadership literature from the perspective of racial difference are concepts taken from the work of Patricia Hill Collins, who has contributed to feminist thought the exposition of Black feminist epistemology[134]. These concepts are the following: valuing concrete experience as a criterion of meaning; using dialogue to assess knowledge claims; an ethic of caring; and an ethic of personal accountability.

Collins grounds her work in the references made by Simmel and by Mannheim to the role of "the stranger." She calls attention to Simmel's claim that the "outsider within" is able to detect patterns which are not visible to the insider, immersed in a world largely of his or her own making; she notes as well Mannheim's argument that the creative development of an academic discipline is essentially dependent upon the critical stimulus provided by "marginal intellectuals," outsiders within the academy[135].

Like Foucault's "subjugated knowledges," the alternative ways of producing and validating knowledge which Collins ascribes to subordinate groups are concerned with "historical knowledge of struggles"; Collins, however, grants such knowledge not only a critical role but also the capacity for positive contribution to mainstream epistemological discourse. The alternative epistemology that Collins offers is both feminist and "Afrocentric," which she qualifies as

---

132 Morrison & Von Glinow (1990)

133 From personal correspondence with Patricia A. Turner, author of *Ceramic Uncles & Celluloid Mammies: Black Images and Their Influence on Culture* (1994).

134 Collins (1986, 1989, 1990)

135 Collins (1986:S15)

reflecting a concern for the self-determination of African-American people and also drawing upon elements of African and African-American tradition. Connections between the critical and conceptual schemes of feminism and of Afrocentrism may be seen in the description which follows of Collins' dimensions of Black feminist epistemology.

Concrete Experience as a Criterion of Meaning.

The need to understand, at a personal level, the dynamics of race, gender, and class subordination results in an emphasis on the concrete in both Afrocentric and feminist perspectives. Recognition of the value of personal experience is associated in the African-American context with the use of narrative, emphasized in theological, among other, thought systems. Such a scheme is seen to exemplify an "inductive system of logic alternately called 'folk wisdom' or a survival-based, need-oriented method of assessing knowledge claims"[136]. In feminist theory, women's concrete experience is seen as privileged; "contextual rules take priority over abstract principles"[137], at least in the prominent argument which links women's differential socialization to their differential moral and psychological development[138]. But the experiences of women and non-white men are seldom the basis for "legitimate" research: Harding asks of mainstream scientific enquiry, "Are women's experiences used as the test of adequacy of the problems, concepts, hypotheses, research design, collection, and interpretation of data?"[139]. This prefigures the sixth question:

Question 6. Is concrete experience, especially that of women and of minority men, a criterion of meaning? Is primary use made of field or laboratory research? Of contextually grounded or off-the-shelf instruments?

In the articles in the management sample the distinction between field and lab research is secondary to the heavy reliance in *both* situations on off-the-shelf instruments and measures. An abundance of such instruments were used in the sample including the MLQ,

---

136 Collins (1989:760, n.3)
137 Collins (1989:761)
138 Chodorow (1978)
139 Harding (1987:11)

JDI, LBDQ-XII, JDS, and OSTI[140]. The "Desert Survival Problem"[141] offers an example of a common leadership-research task which might well be shown to produce varied results, measuring nothing quite so effectively as differences in socialization experiences. As noted in the discussion above, the investigation of gender and racial bias in the research on leadership must emphasize the problematic nature of standardized instruments which assume a homogeneous subject group. The basing of instruments in the concrete experience of only the dominant cultural group ensures the measurement not of leadership ability among non-dominant groups, but of the ability of individuals from these groups to attain a position of leadership without transgressing hidden rules which dictate which leadership style, among which colleagues, and with which subordinates[142]. For example, Eagly and colleagues relate the findings of assymetrical reactions to women's and men's leadership styles:

> ...stereotypically feminine behavior served to demonstrate women's group-oriented motivation and their lack of self-oriented motivation in a potential leadership situation. This proof of acceptable motivation was evidently a prerequisite for effective leadership by women. Men, in contrast, were not suspected of having self-aggrandizing motives and were not required to prove their group-oriented motivation, because group members perceived them as having an inherent right to lead. [143]

Of course, getting there is a skill in itself: that men and women are differentially evaluated as *applicants* is among the findings of yet other empirical literature[144]. Increasing workforce diversity and decreased productivity indicate that the value of traditional, off-the-shelf measures is, at the very least, questionable.

Use of Dialogue in Assessing Knowledge Claims.

---

[140] MLQ (Bass, 1985), JDI (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969), LBDQ-XII (Stogdill & Coons, 1957), JDS (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), and OSTI (Komaki, Zlotnick & Jensen, 1986)

[141] Lafferty, Eady & Elmers (1973)

[142] Eagly et al. (1992)

[143] Eagly et al. (1992:16)

[144] See the review by Olian, Schwab, and Haberfield (1988)

When describing the place of dialogue in the alternate epistemology, Collins invokes the call and response discourse mode that pervades African-American culture from patterns in traditional African music and in oral traditions of storytelling to rap and the distinctive syntax of Black English, where no passive voice construction is possible. The companion concern in feminist theory is that seen in the emphasis, associated with object-relations theory and psychoanalytic feminism, on connection and voice as opposed to the more typically male-centered concern for separation and vision. McHugh et al., in their discussion of psychological research, make reference to the need for dialogue on several levels. One instance of such need can be witnessed at the level of competing explanatory models, communication between which is seldom achieved. At the level of the individual experiment or analysis, dialogue between researcher and subject is equally rare[145]. To what extent is the leadership literature similarly composed of the soliloquies of white men? Or, in a less inflammatory fashion, one might ask:

Question 7. Does the researcher enter into a dialogue with subjects? Does the research make use of feedback from subjects? Are there opportunities for dialogue with competing models?

Communication between researcher and subject has, in the traditional scientific model, been limited to one-way communication: the researcher lays out what is required and the subjects respond. It has not even been expected that the researcher will be completely honest in what minimal discussion does take place. In the illustrative sample used here, the approach to communication with subjects appears well within the traditional framework; however, two of the articles in the sample, one describing a consulting situation and the other a field experimental intervention, did allude to opportunities given for feedback from participants[146]. The suggestion offered by McHugh and colleagues that dialogue might be engendered through data collection techniques and research review procedures in which respondents assist in the formulation of goals and hypotheses[147] would seem

---

145 McHugh et al. (1986:882)

146 Barnes & Kriger (1986); Manz & Sims (1987)

147 McHugh et al. (1986:880)

appropriate in leadership research - doubly so for the purpose of transcending the limitations of measures grounded almost exclusively in the experience of white males. The MLQ, for example, based as it is on the responses of senior army officers and industrial supervisors[148] reveals the twice-limiting effects of apriori instruments: subjects are given only the range of responses originally provided by elite white males within which to express their experience; by its presentation as a finite, "finished" *measure* the instrument admits of no other models.

Dialogue between competing models was little in evidence in the literature reviewed. This study suggests that the "contradictory and inconclusive"[149] empirical findings which are said to characterize the field of leadership might be improved upon with the establishment of some form of dialogue between competing views of leadership. In combination with a lesser reliance on apriori instruments which institutionalize a top-down, universalistic perspective and which perpetuate a given model would further the contextualization of findings, such that new categories of and perspectives on leadership might be theorized. For example, the substantial psychological literature which focuses on problematic intersections of gender and leadership research is, as alluded to earlier, completely left out of the management discourse on leadership. Again, the findings of Eagly and colleagues which indicate that gender-role conflict and gender-role congruency tend to lead to gender-typing of leadership styles[150] must be considered; might not the application of such models as these ameliorate the "contradictory and inconclusive" findings of the management literature on leadership?

The Ethic of Caring.

This set of values is, on the surface, the most foreign to "objective" or "normal science" approaches in organizational analysis, as it is elsewhere in the social or the natural sciences. Collins views the ethic as constituted by three interrelated elements: individual expressiveness, the appropriateness of emotion, and the capacity for empathy. The confluence of dialogue and caring may be seen in her description of the

---

148 Bass et al. (1987)

149 Yukl (1989:253)

150 Eagly et al. (1992); Eagly and Johnson (1990)

call and response discourse mode of the traditional Black church service:

> The sound of what is being said is just as important as the words themselves in what is, in a sense, a dialogue between reason and emotions. As a result, it is nearly impossible to filter out the strictly linguistic-cognitive abstract meaning from the sociocultural psycho-emotive meaning. [151]

That this depiction may combine notions inherent in the concepts of charismatic and transformational leadership, notions which are recurrent in theories of leadership, is obscured by the reluctance, especially in contemporary accounts, to make explicit reference to the role of expressiveness, emotion and empathy. This reluctance may have less to do with the privileging of reason over emotion than with the questionable ethical implications, even in the dominant-group approach to morality, of the leader's ability to control, rouse, direct and manipulate the emotions of subordinates.

Question 8. Are any aspects of an ethic of care addressed? Is the role of individual expressiveness or of emotion addressed? Is empathy, as opposed to instrumentality, valued or given importance?

Recognition of the role of emotion, expressiveness and empathy is not addressed in the research on leadership, with the exception of its largely implicit inclusion in those articles which refer to charismatic and transformational leadership. An example is found in Bass, where expressive behavior is seen as one of the distinguishing characteristics of a charismatic leader[152]; "insight" appears as a more instrumental version of empathy[153]; strong conviction in the righteousness of one's own beliefs and "emotional expressiveness" together might be seen to cover emotion[154]. Notable in such accounts of charismatic or transformational leadership is the legitimation of only the emotionality of the leader, and then of only those aspects of emotionality which are instrumental, which can be turned to the direct benefit of the organization. In the estimation of Van Seters and

---

151 Collins (1989:767)
152 Bass (1988:47)
153 Bass (1988:48)
154 Bass (1988:46)

Field[155], work on transformational leadership constitutes the most recent and most promising "era" of leadership research. Whether this is equivalent to the introduction of an ethic of care or whether the particular brand of emotion deemed appropriate for the transformational leader is in fact "heroic" in the extreme [156] is an important distinction, one which deserves further study.

Ethic of Personal Accountability.

In accordance with the ethic of caring, knowledge claims cannot be evaluated in isolation from the character, values and ethical stance of the knower. Emotions, ethics and reason are seen as interconnected and as essential in assessing the production of knowledge. The distinction between public accountability and personal morality, in the conception of the dominant group, can be seen to vary over time and across geographical boundaries. One might witness, for example, the differential public approbation for the private lives of John F. Kennedy - whose reputed sexual adventures were quietly condoned as proof positive of virile manhood - and, 20 years later, of Gary Hart - whose presidential aspirations were destroyed by lesser, or at least fewer, dalliances. Or one might compare the fate of Gary Hart with that, across the border, of Richard Hatfield, whose reputed shenanigans combining teenage boys, marijuana and junkets aboard the provincial plane did little to interrupt his nearly two-decade-long incumbency as premier of New Brunswick. The distinction, however, between personal responsibility and responsibility in the abstract, or between personal responsibility and ideological stance, appears in the main somewhat less mutable: the men responsible for the technology behind the bomb dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were not personally responsible, either in 1945 or more than 40 years later, when Hollywood re-explored their destinies. The radical science movement, which followed the work of Kuhn and Ravetz, voiced a concern, taken up by Rose, with this refusal of responsibility:

---

[155] Van Seters & Field (1990)

[156] I am indebted to my supervisor, Dallas Cullen, for this point, among thousands of other ideas less easily specified.

> How can science claim to be ideologically pure, value-free, and above all neutral, when even a well-regarded text entitled *The Scientific Method* offers as an example of scientific development the making and testing of napalm on a university playing field, without any references to ethical or political problems? [157]

Rose makes the feminist case for personal accountability in the natural sciences; Collins points out the similarities of the Afrocentric position to the feminist emphasis on the linking of morality, responsibility and the maintenance of social connections. To insist upon the acknowledgement of personal responsibility Collins uses the example of slavery; in her argument she makes reference to the nineteenth century writings of Zilpha Elaw:

> "Oh, the abominations of slavery! ...every case of slavery, however lenient its inflictions and mitigated its atrocities, indicates an oppressor, the oppressed, and oppression."[158]

Collins sees reflected in Zilpha Elaw's description of slavery the "notion that every idea has an owner and that the owner's identity matters" (Collins, 1986:768). In the Black feminist formulation, the absolution of abstraction is denied and "objectivity" is indefensible. As Thomas Kochman noted in his exposition of Black and white "styles", accepting "personal responsibility for the views that one presents requires individuals to develop a personal position. This posture contrasts with the posture of whites when engaging in debate..."[159], or when writing up research results, or when theorizing about leadership.

Question 9. Is an ethic of personal accountability in evidence? Is any other dimension but performance, e.g. morality, addressed?

None of the articles in the sample of the management literature on leadership expands the notion of the responsibility of the leader beyond that for performance outcomes, or for "subordinate satisfaction" narrowly defined. But is the manager responsible for racism among

---

157 Rose (1983:79)
158 Quoted in Collins (1986:768)
159 Kochman (1981:37)

subordinates? To what extent is she or he responsible for the well-being of employees, for the greater good of the community, for the health of the immediate or the global environment? The leadership literature doesn't respond to - nor does it pose - such questions.

Even beyond the issue of the limitation of the personal responsibility of the leader, the question might be formulated as to whether or not the literature of managerial leadership and those who take part in its production are responsible for neglecting the concerns of disadvantaged groups. In his analysis of racism in North America, Wellman denies the actor the right to be judged by his intentions; rather the actor is judged by the consequences of his acts[160]. The conclusion follows that the failure of the literature as a whole to address the concerns of women and of men of color is a failure on the part of the researcher to confront the maintenance, through neglect, of inequality in the organizational setting.

Summary

In this study I am making an attempt to conduct research which reflects the concerns of groups neglected in the mainstream literature of leadership. Through the use of an illustrative sample of articles, the nine questions developed in this chapter illuminate the degree to which the experience and perspectives of women and minority men are excluded from the managerial leadership literature. In order to ascertain the degree to which the present research succeeds or fails to address the concerns of these neglected groups, the same questions are applied, in Chapters 4 and 6, to both the primary and secondary phases of my analysis.

In Chapter 3, before moving to the analysis, details are provided of the place in which and the people among whom the research was conducted.

---

[160] Wellman (1977:8, 206)

CHAPTER 3

SUBJECT GROUP

Rationale

The purpose of this particular study is to begin to address the concerns of women and minority men as leaders. The men and women who are the subjects of the study are the directors of festivals which take place in Edmonton and in Calgary, Alberta. The choice of subject group was made in an explicit attempt to access those whose concerns are neglected by the mainstream literature on leadership: among the group of festival directors are women and men who differ in terms of race, culture of origin, background, philosophy and sexual preference from those who make up the vast majority of subjects in the mainstream literature.

The reliance in the present research on unstructured, open-ended interviews is intended to allow the interviewees the opportunity to introduce and pursue their own interests and concerns as these pertain to the question of leadership. In concert with the subject group focused upon, this enables the study to satisfy the first point raised in the critique, addressing the concerns of women and minority men as leaders.

Although only the director, who is usually the most "public" person in the festival organization, was interviewed, the subject group in general terms is not one of the current, or former, high-profile groups in organizational analysis; in this way the second point of the critique, changing the focus from the visible and dramatic, is incorporated in the research. Neither the historical bias in the organizational literature for the corporate and the managerial, nor the current fascination with high finance, high tech, and multinationals has tended to bring into focus either women or minority men. Nor is the leadership of these festivals in general highly visible to the average citizen: festivals are most often regarded as belonging to the public and imagined as associated with, if not administered by, the municipality.[161] That the subject directors are leaders whose public profile is not prominent beyond their own circle is, however, *not* the central issue here: at issue

---

[161] This association is not accidental: the dependence on municipal good will and funding is enshrined in the official names of half the festivals noted, which begin with either "Calgary" or "Edmonton".

is the accounting for their leadership by women and minority men as less visible subjects in the *study* of leadership. This point, as stated above, is satisfied by the subject group chosen.

The impact of the "realities of race and gender" on the subject of leadership was specifically sought, as well, in the selection of the subject group and methodology; thus, the grounding assumption was of heterogeneity, in accordance with the third point of the critique and opposing the assumption of a single society. Nine of the 16 directors interviewed (56%) were women, 3 (19%) were visible minorities.

In more conventional terms, three additional reasons for studying the leadership of festivals might be articulated. First, such a strategy has effectively enabled me to control for type of organization and, within a certain range, for size. This, in conjunction with access to non-traditional subjects of leadership research, provides the study with both constraints and a broad range of representative voices.

Second, parallels can be drawn between festival organizations and both entrepreneurial ventures and "spin-off" companies. In the former regard, one key person or group is usually, historically, instrumental in building the permanent festival organization from an original, temporary structure. In the latter regard, the 'parent' company, usually a funding agency, provides total support for the temporary festival organization until such time as the festival leadership is successful in winning at least a measure of independence through self-support and external funding. Third, the combination of diverse and creative financing, the utilization of volunteer, contract, temporary and permanent employees, the focus on both local communities and global issues are key concerns preoccupying festival leadership. These last two aspects ensure the relevance of the group studied within the larger, contemporary organizational context, with its emphasis on innovative structuring, dynamic change, and diversity.

"Edmonton is Canada's Festival City "

Or so state the promotional materials provided under the auspices of Edmonton's Convention and Tourism Authority. Edmonton is Canada's fifth largest city and the capital of Alberta; more to the point, it is the largest *northern-most* city in Canada. Far removed from the major touring routes for travelling entertainment, Edmonton's culture industry has had little choice but to

be, for the most part, self-sustaining - or, as one festival director phrases it, "we've always had to grow our own."

Edmonton has traditionally looked to the rural agricultural fair as its model of "home-grown" cultural activity[162]. The festival model was reinforced and, to a great extent, institutionalized in 1980, when the provincial government, with what then seemed the unlimited largesse of the "boom" years of Alberta's oil industry, made available unprecedented sums of money for mostly summer celebrations of the province's 75th anniversary. The funding structure which was utilized[163] encouraged the mounting of individual festivals, taking place to some extent in the rural areas, but concentrated in Edmonton, the provincial capital, and in Calgary, unofficial capital of the oil industry.

Within two years of the province's 75th birthday celebration, the Fringe Theatre Festival, the Heritage Days Festival, two Folk Festivals, two Jazz Festivals, two Children's Theatre Festivals, The Works Visual Arts Festival, and the Street Performers Festival, were among the festivals either established or on their way to becoming established as annual events. The festival model in Alberta tends to incorporate, according to the festival directors, certain common elements. A festival is an annual occurance[164], usually more than one day in

---

[162] As of 1993, more than half the population of Alberta was accounted for in the city centres of Edmonton (pop. 626,999) and Calgary (pop. 727,719); beyond the greater metropolitan areas of these two cities, the population is thinly scattered across the 661,185 square kilometres of the province.

[163] An umbrella organization (Summerfest) was originally set up which distributed funding to various not-for-profit societies putting together celebrations of art and culture. As money inevitably became more scarce ("We were scratching each other's EYES out," as one man put it), this organization ceased to act as funder and turned to producing only the Street Performers Festival. Funding for most festivals is now sought from municipal, provincial and federal agencies and from corporate sponsors on an individual basis, although several consortia and festival associations now exist as lobbying groups.

[164] One of the directors commented that the seasonal festival cycle is traceable not only to the pattern of Alberta's agricultural fairs, but to the medieval Christian reclamations of pagan harvest festivals. The

duration[165], with an emphasis on accessibility and a public presence, both of which combine to create a "festive" atmosphere under which some normal rules of conduct are suspended: streets may be closed to automobiles; beer gardens set up in city parks; vendors and street performers take over grassy areas and sidewalks; musicians perform in once-quiet cafes; films and plays are shown until the wee hours of a weeknight; banners, posters, streamers and handbills proliferate.

Edmonton does, in fact, host a number of the larger festivals to be found in North America and, some claim, the world. The Fringe Theatre Festival, a festival of alternative theatre, is said to be the first or second largest of its kind; the Edmonton Folk Festival is argued to be one of the three largest folk festivals[166]. The Edmonton Heritage Days Festival bills itself as "The World's Largest Celebration of Multiculturalism" and the Klondike Days Festival claims to run, for the length of the festival, "one of the world's largest casinos."

Subject Festivals

Festival Structure

The festivals discussed here are most often set up as non-profit societies and are run by volunteer boards of directors; one is run out of a privately held organization.

"ag fair" is still an annual event of some magnitude, both in rural Alberta and in the city of Edmonton, where it has been institutionalized under the powerful Northlands Corporation. In Calgary, the local agricultural fair has metamorphosed over the years to become the world-renowned Calgary Stampede. An eloquent and heartfelt description from one festival director neatly encapsulates the clout wielded by these twin symbols of corporate agriculture: "In Calgary, you've got the Stampede and if you think Northlands is powerful, they ain't nothing compared to the - that STAMPEDE has that fucking town sewn UP!"

[165] As will be noted in Table 2, there are exceptions to this, as to almost every one of these very general commonalities.

[166] And was described as "quite possibly the hippest festival in North America" by that purveyor of hip, *Rolling Stone Magazine*, or so I was told more than once.

There is often, as will be seen in Table 2 below, only one full-time paid staff person; typically this is the position of the Producer or Executive Director, the position held by the person interviewed for this research. In six cases here, the Director or Producer is also the founder. In the largest festivals, there are other full-time employees; fairly often, for example, the areas of general and artistic management are split between two people.

Most typically, "staff" other than the Director will be at most half-time employees. These people are usually employed six months out of the year, rather than half-days all year. The majority of staff are hired on a contract basis for three or four months around the time of the festival.

At the next level are volunteer "Coordinators". These are typically volunteers who are experienced in a functional area of the festival and who take on responsibility for heading up that section of the festival organization. Often becoming involved at board level, this group is the primary management team. In the larger festivals they may be paid an honorarium, one which can vary in size according to the profitability of the festival but which would rarely exceed a thousand dollars. These volunteer staff persons would quite typically work the equivalent of four to six full time weeks, working evenings and weekends and, surprisingly often, taking vacation time from their "day jobs" to work full time during the festival itself.

Volunteers are generally divided between functional areas and given orientation in two or more group sessions from one month to six weeks before the festival. The number of volunteers for the festivals studied here varies from between 10 to 6000.

Festival Description

A summary of information for each of the subject festivals is presented in Table 2. Given on the left are the title, a brief description of the festival, and the month in which the festival takes place. An asterisk beside the festival title indicates that the festival is a member of the Alberta Arts Festival Association (described below under "Making Contact".)

The information on the right includes the following: first, the number of volunteers (*vols*) is listed. The description of *staff* indicates the number of full-time paid staff (*f/t* or *full*); staff who are paid for six months of the year are listed as half-time (*half* or

1/2t). In one case, a staff person is listed as *2/3t*, working eight months of the year. *Seasonal* staff work an average of three months around the time of the event. Festivals listing *contract* or *part time* staff (*p/t*) did not give a specific length of contract. In a few cases, the number of staff is expressed in terms "equivalent to" fulltime staff (e.g. 2.2 f/t).

The duration of the festival is given in number of *days*; in the case of Black History Month, events are spread out over the entire month. Figures for *audience* are given either per day or as a total over the span of the festival; these numbers are often listed as an amount "greater than" (>) or "less than" (<) a certain figure. A final indication of the size of the event is given by number of *venues* or by number of performances (*perfs*); in a few cases, the number of *performers* (spelled out) or *artists* was more readily available, and that figure is given. For the film festivals, the figure for performances (*perfs/screenings*) includes screenings and other events, such as workshops.

Table 2

Black Heritage Month *arts and culture* FEBRUARY	vols: 60 staff: 1 (1/2t), 2 seasonal days: throughout Feb. audience: >1000 venues: 10
Calgary International Children's Festival * *performing and visual arts for children* MAY	vols: 1300 staff: 1 f/t days: 6 audience: 60,000 venues: 8
Calgary Jazz Festival * *international jazz music* JUNE-JULY	vols: 200 staff: 2.2 f/t; 4 seasonal days: 10 audience: 50,000 venues: 16; perfs: 80
Cariwest Caribbean Carnival *arts and culture* JULY	vols: staff: 0 paid staff days: 3 audience: venues: perfs:
Dreamspeakers *"An International Aboriginal Cultural, Artistic & Film Festival"* SEPTEMBER	vols: 440 staff: 4 f/t; 25 seasonal days: 6 audience: 30,000 performers: >100

Edmonton Folk Music Festival* *international folk music* AUGUST	vols: 1100 staff: 3 full, 2 half days: 4 audience: <15,000/day venues: 8; perfs: 110
Edmonton Fringe Festival * *theatre, street performers* AUGUST	vols: 1200 staff: 5 f/t; 100 seasonal days: 10 audience: 500,000 venues: 18; perfs: 1200
Edmonton Heritage Days Festival *arts and culture* AUGUST	vols: 6000 staff: 2 f/t; 2-3 seasonal days: 3 audience: 400,000 performers: >1000
Edmonton's Klondike Days *exposition, midway, casino* JULY	vols: 200 staff: 65 f/t; >2000 p/t days: 10 audience: <800,000 venues: 16; perfs: 120
Edmonton Street Performers Festival * *street performers* JULY	vols: 250 staff: 1f/t; 1(2/3t); 3 seasonal days: 10 audience: 160,000 venues: 8; perfs: 900
Edmonton Works Festival * *visual arts* JUNE-JULY	vols: 1200, +5000hrs arts org'n volunteers staff: 4 f/t; 65 seasonal/contract days: 13 audience: 250,000 venues: 43; artists: 967
First Night Festival * *"A New Years Eve Celebration of the Arts"* DECEMBER 31	vols: 850 staff: 1 full; 13 contract days: 1 audience: 35,000 venues: 30; perfs: 150
GALA - Gay and Lesbian Film Festival *mostly independent films, in association with Pride Week* JUNE	vols: 51 staff: 0 paid staff days: 3 audience: 450 perfs/screenings: 17
Global Visions Festival (formerly Third World Film Festival) *film, arts, culture* MARCH	vols: 130 staff: 1 halftime days: 7 audience: 3,000 venues: 6; perfs: >120

In-Sight, *"A Festival of Women's Film and Video"* NOVEMBER	vols: 40 staff: 3 part time days: 3 audience: <500 perfs/screenings: > 30
Local Heroes Film Festival *independent films and premiere screenings national competition winners* MARCH	vols: 40 staff: 6f/t; 5 seasonal days: 5 audience: 20,000 perfs/screenings: <50

Making Contact

In each case, I contacted the festival office, explained that I was doing research on leadership, and asked to make an appointment for a brief (30 minute) interview with the festival director. In most cases, I spoke with the director her- or himself to make the appointment and thus had the opportunity to explain a bit about my research before the first meeting. I asked at the time of making the appointment whether I would be able to tape the interviews and, in all cases, received permission to do so.

Of the 16 festival directors interviewed, nine were women and three were visible minorities. One of the festivals is run by a collective; a quorum of the collective was interviewed as a group. A second festival comes under the aegis of an organization run as a collective while the festival itself, structured as a discrete project, is hierarchically organized; in this case there is one director for the festival and that person was interviewed as an individual. Six of the directors were the founders of festivals; the role of the founder formed a theme in discussions which is discussed in Chapter 4.

My own experience with festivals spanned several years at the coordinator level for two festivals; for one of these I also worked a seasonal contract position. Before beginning the interview process, while designing the research proposal for this study, I imagined that my experience with festivals would be relevant to the interviewees, adding to my legitimacy by rendering me in their eyes not only "a university student", or "someone from the business school", but at least partially "an insider" as well. In addition, I believed that my experience would enable me to better understand the concerns and perspectives of the directors. In fact, I took on the contract position with a festival during the

proposal process with the express intent of accumulating time as a "participant observer". I did not interview the director of the festival with which I had been most closely associated, believing then and now that it would not be possible for me to untangle personal from "formal" interactions in a transcript.

While in retrospect I believe strongly that my experience was indeed useful in preparing me for this research, I was very surprised at the time of the interviews to uncover a myriad of connotations that my festival experience acquired in the minds of some of the directors. I was in some cases informed of, and eventually noticed on my own, several categories of festivals which were operative in the festival community. First, a distinction is made between arts festivals and "other" festivals; this distinction is formalized in the existence of an Alberta Arts Festivals Association. In Table 2, above, the starred festivals are members. As might be surmised by the information in the table, the distinction between an "arts festival" and a "non-arts festival" is not intuitively obvious, nor is membership granted as a matter of course to festivals fitting an objective description; a formal petition must be made to the association if a festival desires to become a member. Among the arts festivals directors, I was treated very much as an insider: I was asked to attend meetings, treated to lunch, free passes and gossip, and invited to serve as a member, a volunteer, or on the board.

The Edmonton Festivals Association includes all of the starred festivals in addition to Klondike Days and the Heritage Days Festival; out-of-town festivals are not included. I was told that, historically, these latter two festivals chose not to be associated with the arts festivals on some lobbying matters, bringing about the separation of the two associations. I have no idea of the type of lobbying on which these festivals would disagree, but I did feel that these two large "non-arts" festivals regarded me first and foremost as a business student; my experience with the arts festivals seemed somewhat irrelevant, as if I had taken the time to inform them, unasked, about a personal pastime.

The position of the film festivals, vis-à-vis the arts/non-arts community seemed neutral. These groups seemed more oriented toward other Canadian film festivals than interested in other Edmonton festivals. These groups seemed to understand my experience with arts festivals as quasi-proof of a political orientation: "Oh, a business student, but a *liberal*."

The attitude of the Black History Month group and that of the Cariwest Festival toward the arts/non-arts designation seemed one of wariness: for example, in one case I was informed in indignant terms of the disparity of funding evident between "ethnic" festivals and "the other festivals." These groups seemed to find my experience either irrelevant or as vaguely suspicious: white business student, artsy.

In every case, I believe that I established a good rapport with the interviewee. Some interviews included "rough spots" (two notable examples are discussed in Chapter 6), but all ended on friendly terms. Although my position as "an insider" was established most easily among the arts festivals, by the end of most of the other interviews as well I received invitations to take part in festival work and/or celebrations. In most cases, I enjoyed and admired the people I spoke with, and left off interviewing with the sense that I would like to keep in touch.

Summary

It has taken me years to be able to look with a new perspective on the selection of this particular group of people, in this particular industry, as the subject of my dissertation research and, I thought perhaps, as a starting point for a stream of future research. It seems to have become, in the last several years, acceptable and even preferable to admit to the reasons for choosing a research site other than those which accord most objectively and resoundingly with theoretical imperatives: I could have easily added, for example, to the statement of rationale which opened this chapter a coda, saying, "AND because I can get access, AND because I worked there, AND because I don't think I will be bored."

But, looking back, years after I began to draft a dissertation proposal, I believe that the festival industry held an additional attraction for me. In spite of having gone back to university and having begun to experience that plummeting sensation in the pit of my self-esteem, I was able to recapture, in my work with the festivals, the feeling that I was making use of my talents in an effective and almost effortless way. I knew I was good at what I did, I thoroughly enjoyed it, and the work itself seemed almost constantly celebratory. Once it occurred to me to do research in the festival industry, I clung to the idea like a drowning woman clutching at - helium balloons, of many colours.

CHAPTER 4

FIRST THEMES

In this chapter interview data is analyzed for the presence of *themes*, both those common across subjects and those unique to the individual subject. A theme is identified as a recurrent motif, one which is seen to be repeated within or across accounts. First to be explored are those themes which are found in the accounts presented by more than one subject; these themes will be addressed in the order from most frequently to least frequently cited. Illustrations, in the form of excerpts from the transcribed interviews, are provided for all major and minor themes. Connections between themes will be the subject of particular attention.

Both the themes which result and the method by which they were derived are evaluated against the critique developed in the second chapter. The critique of these themes demonstrates the limitations of the aggregating techniques central to traditional qualitative methodology; the chapter ends with the implications of these results in the search for a more productive methodology.

A Traditional Approach to Interview Data

This first phase of the analysis is congruent with what may be considered an orthodox social science approach to the analysis of interview data[167]. The sample population was chosen in accordance with a working

---

[167] In making this claim, I have made extensive use of the massive *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, by Denzin and Lincoln (1994), less to compare this first part of the analysis to the "state of the art" approaches described therein, than to check its congruence with what is portrayed as commonly accepted procedure. In the editors' introduction to the second part of the *Handbook*, "Major Paradigms and Perspectives", they refer unproblematically to "a traditional, qualitative, grounded theory approach to validity and theory construction". This will be seen to be an accurate description of the approach outlined in this section.

hypothesis[168], as detailed in the previous chapter. The research question, exploratory in nature and centering on the generation of theory, is appropriate to qualitative analysis[169] and the multiple case study approach[170]. The detailed research plan was reviewed for adherence to accepted ethical norms by an academic committee and was approved.

Two pilot interviews were undertaken, both of which followed the semi-structured, open-ended format utilized in the main body of interviews, and which focused on testing the response to the primary research question[171]. The major work of data collection was comprised of interviews which ranged in length from 20 minutes to three hours, and which were conducted with 16 festival directors. Four directors were interviewed a second time, in an attempt to gain additional detail on common areas in the first interviews, and to offer subjects a final opportunity for questions and comments[172].

All interviews were taped and fully transcribed[173] by me[174]. In accordance with the method which was originally propounded in Glaser and Strauss' *Grounded Theory*, the analysis was begun concurrently with data collection, which strengthened the attention given certain emergent themes in interviews conducted later in the process and in second interviews. Coding and categorizing occupied a

---

168 Theoretical sampling receives attention in Glaser & Strauss (1967); Strauss (1987); and in the work on the qualitative methodology "audit" by Schwandt & Halpern (1988).

169 Eisenhardt (1989), Marshall & Rossman (1989), Yin (1984).

170 Referred to by Herriott & Firestone as the "multisite qualitative research" (1983; cited by Stake, 1994) and by Stake as the "collective case study" (1994). In calling it a multiple case study, I am following Yin (1984).

171 Pilot studies receive particular attention in Yin (1984) and in Janesick (1994).

172 I considered this crucial to the establishment of a level of rapport with subjects which could be maintained after I left the city in which the research took place.

173 I agree with Reissman (1993) that transcription is underrecognized as a critical dimension of the analysis; this point is elaborated as a major part of the argument in the next chapter.

174 with the exception of the first of the pilot interviews which was only partially transcribed. This interview was held in French; those transcriptions which were made were translated by me.

major portion of the analysis, again making particular use of the methodology of grounded theory[175].

My use of this methodology has been particularly driven by the desire to give priority to the voices of the festival directors interviewed. In accordance with the fourth point of the critique applied to the mainstream literature, I hope to counter in this research the assumption of race- and gender-neutrality which characterizes that literature. I attempted to avoid the fictitious neutrality institutionalized in the mainstream perspective through a reliance in the first instance not on the themes, concepts and generalities of the existing literature, but on those themes emergent from the interview data.

Coded and categorized, then, as major themes in this phase of the analysis were the topics which were repeated within and across the accounts of the directors interviewed. Whether and to what extent these themes reflect those of the mainstream leadership literature is strictly secondary in importance: emphasized here are those issues and concerns surrounding leadership most often given voice by a group considered non-typical in the mainstream view, when they are considered at all.

Criteria

Internal validity in this part of the analysis is attained through prescriptions for open, or preliminary, coding, axial coding (coding around specific, emergent categories) and selective coding (of core, or primary, categories) which make "the *relevance of the coding* to the real world of data... a central issue" [176] Core categories, the "themes" presented here, fulfilled the criteria for centrality (were related to many other categories); frequency (appeared frequently in the data); ease of relation to other categories (frequent and abundant connections to other categories); implications

---

[175] This section of my analysis is specifically patterned on the more recent versions of the original work on grounded theory: Strauss (1987) and Strauss and Corbin (1994). That grounded theory has become the standard, orthodox social science approach may be inferred from the title of Strauss' 1987 presentation of this methodology: it is titled, simply, *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*.

[176] Strauss (1987:17), emphasis in original.

for more general theory (evident in relation to leadership theory); maximum variation (dimensions, properties, conditions, consequences, and strategies of the categories were noted)[177].

External validity is determined through the ongoing comparison of findings from the sample population with the results of analyses which compose the corpus of mainstream leadership research. The primary references in this regard are Bass' 1990 edition of *Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, and four of the foremost North American academic journals in the field of organizational research, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, and the Academy of Management journals: the *Academy of Management Journal*, the *Academy of Management Review*, and the *Academy of Management Executive*.

Reliability and objectivity, the criteria which come most often under scrutiny in qualitative research, are demonstrated through the generous use of excerpts from the data. Reference to the original data provides the reader the opportunity to evaluate both the relation between data and findings and the findings themselves for bias on the part of the researcher.

Specifics of the method

While excerpts are presented here without disfluencies, pauses, false starts, and backchannelling by the interviewer, copies of the original transcripts, which preserve all of these features, are available from the author. Excerpts from the transcripts make use of the following conventions: words in ALL CAPITALS were given particular emphasis by the speaker, (usually increased volume and exaggerated pronunciation, often accompanied by facial or hand gestures). Ellipsis markers are used here to indicate missing data (and not a pause on the part of the speaker). Words entered [in square brackets] have been supplied by the author in order to either make the excerpt more readily understandable, to offer a guess in place of a word which was unclear in the original recording, or, occasionally, to provide details of the delivery of the text: that it was [whispered] or given [in a deep, stagey voice]. Speakers' initials, included so that the reader may be aware of consistency and variation in the remarks of a single speaker, have been changed to preserve the

---

[177] following Strauss (1987:36).

anonymity of the speaker, as have any references to the specific festival being discussed.

Stakeholders, Visionaries and Stages

The major themes which are the result of this analysis are grouped in three categories. Leaders' perceptions of *Stakeholders* make up the first category and the most often noted theme in the comments of the festival directors; because of the complexity of the various stakeholder groups discussed, this category is divided into three subcategories. The discussion of *Volunteers* occupies the first of these, as leaders describe the creation of a temporary, and sometimes massive, workforce from a pool of unpaid labour. In the second subcategory are collected references to those stakeholders whose primary status designation is that of "insider" or "outsider": relations with *Agencies, Boards and Staff* are discussed here. The third *Stakeholder* category illustrates the constructions of *Artist* or *Performer* and of *Community* as these vary from festival to festival, and from leader to leader.

The second major category, *(Super)Vision*, presents the various conceptions of the vision which the leader brings to or shares with the festival. The act of visioning is seen as connected to both the creation, from a distinctive perspective, of stakeholder groups, especially those of artist and community, and to the leader's ascription of her- or himself to the specific stage of development or of the lifecycle of their respective festival.

The third major theme, that of the *Stages* through which festivals progress, centred around the symbolic role of the founder and the conundrum of personality: whether the personality creates the festival, or the festival creates the personality.

Stakeholders (1): Volunteer Labour and Participative Leadership

> nn: I absolutely believe in the sense of team responsibility, where there isn't a hierarchy, but that people work off each other. ... And so it has to be in your mind set to be willing to include other people in your job description.

The sole theme which was referred to by every person interviewed can be characterized as that of *stakeholders*. It is not surprising that none of the festival directors found a way to respond to the question "Do you consider

yourself a leader?" without referring to the various others among whom their work is situated. A recent overview of the literature by Kets de Vries conceptualizes leadership as dependent upon "a complex pattern of interaction among leader, follower, and situation"[178]; this formulation is lodged firmly both in the modern idiom and in the modern consciousness[179].

Stakeholders in the festival organization make up both followers and key elements of the situation of the director. The board of directors, for example, is only sometimes conceived of as comprising a significant element of the situation; other boards, composed of volunteers whose terms are limited and whose experience with the festival is comparatively brief, are more accurately addressed as followers. Conversely, an experienced volunteer corps attached to a festival can easily function as an immutable facet of the situation with which a new festival director might be confronted, rather than as docile followers. In these interviews, stakeholders were discussed in general terms and/or under the more specific categories of *artist or performer*, *board of directors*, *community or "the public"*, *outside agencies*, *staff*, and *volunteers* [180].

Volunteers were the most often-discussed group, reinforcing the notion that these unpaid organization members constitute a potentially productive area of study. A persistent topic of sociological interest over the years, volunteerism is still largely unexplored in terms of organizational research. The institutionalization of such programs as the Volunteer Sector Management Program at York University, however, may attest to its growing importance as a subject for

---

[178] Kets de Vries (1994:73)

[179] This point will be taken up again in the conclusion.

[180] Although these subcategories of the stakeholder theme are presented here as if they were unproblematically discrete, in fact there is considerable overlap between categories. As will be addressed later in the chapter, the term "community" is used to describe widely divergent groups according to the speaker and to the vision that he or she propounds, either personally, politically, or on behalf of his or her festival. Thus "the community" is at times used to refer to the community of volunteers, constituting an overlap between subcategories. The stakeholder group "board of directors" is also composed of volunteers, again blurring the distinction implied here.

organizational analysis. The possible reasons, given by interviewees, for the existence in Edmonton of a significant pool of volunteer labour are closely associated with the "Festival City" phenomenon enunciated in the last chapter. But for many of the directors interviewed, often despite their extensive experience with volunteer workers, the commitment to the organization on the part of this group of stakeholders remained a cause for wonder:

> aa: I think a lot of people really look forward to the summer. And more and more Edmontonians... don't go AWAY for their vacation. We have people that VOLUNTEER during their vacation for us full time. They might be bookkeepers, or desk people and all of the sudden they're picking up TRASH for ten days...
>
> bb: But we called all the volunteers and had a meeting, and every one of them said they'll support it. ... And there's that kind of commitment, I mean, what do they get out of it? More work. It's quite impressive 'n it's humbling in a way, too, 'cause these are people that are working for nothing...
>
> *(Do you find that most of your volunteers are [fans of the artform?])*
> cc: No, no. Actually not. A lot of them become [fans] but that doesn't seem to be the main motivation to get people involved with us. People tend to work more than one festival, rather than be loyal to one event... The key volunteers usually tend to be - WELL, I can't even say that. We've got some people that work really hard with us, for many years, that are not primarily [fans]. To come back, year after year, you have to enjoy it, but we've got people who work many festivals, equally hard. So, yeah, it's interesting.

Virtually everyone interviewed indicated that volunteer labour was the linchpin without which their festivals would not take place. It is worth noting that only one person mentioned having the least concern about attracting a sufficient number of volunteers, and the concern in that instance was voiced as a thing of the past. None of the festival directors, however, portrayed volunteers as a facet of the organization which could be taken for granted; volunteers were characterized as loyal, committed, energetic, and, among other qualities, cheap, but never as wholly unproblematic. Several commented on the differences between paid and unpaid

workers, and some on the difficulties particular to unpaid workers.

> dd: We've got [x number of] volunteers, and they're just like staff, only you have less leverage 'cause you're not paying them. But they're not quite like staff because they haven't chosen this as a career, so you have to figure out what their commitment to the event is.

> ee: involving all those volunteers and getting their input and coordinating them to do this, that, and the next thing is a challenge in itself. Because [you're] trying to do a very professional job in terms of production, so that the gates open on time and things happen as they're supposed to happen, and sometimes, with volunteers, that can be difficult, because they haven't got the same commitment as a professional paid worker would have.

In fact, and as one might expect, the *same* people can be seen to refer to volunteers in ways which are at times almost poetic, and at times rather forcefully pragmatic:

> bb: I think anybody in my position has to realize it's an honor -- when there's [x number of] people working for nothing for this organization [dramatic whisper] I NEVER expect to have to motivate any of the people that are working here. I never have to expect to motivate myself... If I'm not excited about this job, get the hell out.

> bb: and there's parts of my job that I don't like, and I'm going to have to look at an interfamily squabble that we have here and there. Believe me, when you get [x number of] volunteers -- [whispers] we've got some wackos in there.

The skills needed by a festival director will be examined in more detail below. It must be noted at this point, however, that volunteer labour was most often portrayed as requiring either a different complex of leadership skills for its management or a more intensely focused set of the same skills required to lead paid employees:

> ff: It's one thing to be able to set out rules and regulations, but it's another thing to be able to get

the cooperation and put that across, particularly in dealing with volunteers.

gg: This is a volunteer thing. It's not a business. And if you run it like a business, then people are going to steer away from it.

While the skill sets required to work successfully with volunteers varied among the directors, those most often cited centred on the management of volunteer commitment and motivation; while the motivation of volunteers was portrayed as a marvelous thing, it was nowhere described as self-sustaining. The ability to understand and direct the commitment and motivation of volunteers was conceived of for the most part as a function of *both* the interpersonal competence of the director and of his or her ability to "organize". In this, the directors seemed to display a marked concern for what has been widely hypothesized as the *dual nature of leadership*, whether it be divided into task and relations orientations[181] or initiating structure and consideration[182]:

ff: You MUST be a strong organizer in order to put a function like this on. You also have to be a good people-person. You have to be able to work with people, at every level, because you're working with volunteers all down the line. The board of directors are all volunteers. And you're working with, in this case, to put this festival on, we've got over [x number of] volunteers. You have to be a strong people-person as well as an organizer.

hh: ...to exhibit leadership qualities, I have to convey a sense of warmth and caring for everybody in here. I have to show strength and severity when necessary...

ii: We meet every Monday morning, and we check in, we connect with each other, what went well, what's not going so well, what do we need help with, or whatever.

---

[181] Although the terms are still widely used, the results of most recent work on Fiedler's contingency model, as measured by the LPC, dispute the validity of the model. See Bass (1990:510).

[182] A fairly recent meta-analysis of the LBDQ, the SBDQ and the LBDQ-XII is Fisher and Edwards (1988).

> And so I guess if I were to define leadership in my own role, that's how I would define it, by empowering leadership throughout the organization, with individuals at whatever level they're at, and making sure that there's assignments, or directives, or support for them to be leaders in their own way.

The heterogeneity which most directors ascribed to the volunteers associated with their respective festivals went beyond conceptualizations of volunteers as committed or not-professional, highly motivated or "wackos". As mentioned above in the description of the festival organizations, volunteers tend to be employed at a front-line or operational level, at the level of a management team, and at the board level; while the relative importance of these various groups differed from one festival to another, it was clear that most directors saw a corresponding shift in their role vis-a-vis the disparate "levels" of volunteers in their organizations:

> cc: I think especially in a volunteer organization, good leadership is vital, both leadership of the smaller team -- it's important to be able to inspire, motivate, and direct that smaller group of people -- and I think it's also important in the bigger picture of leading the whole crew of volunteers, who will run the festival, even though many of them, I might not know their names or recognize their faces again if I saw them in the supermarket. I think their perception of me as leader is more important than any interaction which I might have with those individuals.

Volunteers at the level of coordinator are treated as "staff"; their characteristics and concerns are often conflated with those of the paid staff, making the distinction between the two at times unclear[183]. It was primarily in association with this level of volunteers, and with paid staff, that the second most prominent theme appeared: directors tended to refer to their relations with workers in terms reflecting *egalitarian, democratic, and participative leadership styles*. Although the currency of these terms as buzzwords of questionable sincerity or depth is undeniable, on the whole a certain sophistication in the use of these terms *and* their associated concepts was evident. Egalitarian or

---

[183] This can be seen in certain of the following excerpts and will be addressed under *staff* below.

democratic styles, often in contrast to "hierarchical" styles, were seen as connected in important ways to volunteer and staff loyalty, to the development of volunteers and staff, and to the commitment of workers to the organization and the organization's goals[184]:

> hh: we feel it's a real community effort and we stress that a lot. We stress the team effort here, and everyone involved with it feels a little bit of the image of the festival and they take it very seriously. We don't have much turn over on staff. We have people that stay on for several years. They get quite loyal to the event and that helps us too.

> kk: *[speaking about empowerment:]* Volunteer development is critical for a festival of this nature. We try and develop their enthusiasm to the extent in which they'll come back year after year. And we do. We have dozens and dozens of volunteers that always come back, every year, sometimes just to do a ten hour position at the festival itself, but other times to take on a more active coordinating role for the festival.

Some of the directors used the model of the *team* as one which joined the notions of egalitarian leadership, participation, loyalty and commitment in an image particularly appropriate to the characteristic pressures of festival management: the process of organizing what is often a very large organization within very compressed timelines, using volunteers and, usually, a very small and temporary staff[185].

> cc: teamworking. That's the only way you can get through this, is inspiring people to make a commitment to the team that makes it all happen. Yeah, being not

---

184 The most recent review of the literature on democratic leadership suggests that where employee development, commitment and loyalty are important to productivity, democratic approaches are, in the long term, most effective. (Bass, 1990:435)

185 Or, as one director put it "to have one permanent staff and [x number of] volunteers, to sell [x number] of tickets, to run in [x number]of venues, to bring in companies from 11 countries, you know, like, you gotta be crazy."

afraid to roll up your own sleeves and pitch in (laugh).

ll: And I have been able to surround myself with an extraordinary team of people who come back to me year after year. I tend to get a lot of outside credit for what I do and I appreciate that very much but I'm the first one to hand it over to the team of people who help me. Because they are extraordinary.

Evident in several comments was the tension between the need for participation and the severe time constraints which are endemic to the festival industry and which mitigate against participation: volunteers at the coordinator level might begin spending a few hours a week on festival business three months before the festival; the main body of volunteers, numbering from several hundred to several thousand, may not even be recruited until a month before the event.

cc: Creating a strong team of really committed volunteers has become very much a priority for this year... It's a matter of starting earlier with a few people, because it's so easy ... for just the staff and perhaps one or two volunteers to cope with everything up until the last minute, when you realize you should have a well-trained team in place... but, by that time you don't have the opportunity to train people. So, it's a matter of training people before you think you need them.

Vroom's original leadership model fit situational requirements with prescriptions for decision-making which is more autocratic or more participative; the most recent modifications to this model add questions concerning, among other topics, subordinate access to information and time constraints. According to the model, limited information and tight time constraints make a more autocratic decision-making style most likely to be effective, in terms of both employee satisfaction and quality of decision[186].

It becomes obvious, then, why volunteer commitment and loyalty are critical in the festival organization: an experienced volunteer corps, upon whom the festival can depend to return year after year, effectively negates the time constraints of the festival calendar and the straitened access to information typical of the skeleton

---

[186] Vroom & Jago (1988).

staff used in a festival organization, in which the director is often the only fulltime employee. The key processes, judging by the number of interviews in which they were mentioned, through which the dual nature of leadership is realized are those of *delegation and empowerment*.

In the discussions of various participative styles and approaches, empowerment and delegation together comprised a significant theme. It is interesting to note that there was very little overlap between the use of the two terms: those directors who talked about delegation did not refer to empowerment, and vice versa, with only one exception. While no mechanism for distinguishing between the usages of the two terms[187] was built into the interview design, and while there is certainly not enough evidence in this set of interview data to offer any claim as to differences of nuance between the terms, the virtual absence of overlap does raise questions: are the terms considered synonymous? Is delegation unneccessary when employees are empowered? There is some indication on the part of those who speak of empowerment that there is an impact - a benign, though significant, impact - upon the power position of the director who empowers others:

> kk: I know that experience from other areas where I worked in hierarchial leadership models. People are afraid of losing their positions if other people become too empowered to do them. I'm the opposite of that. I couldn't survive without it. Volunteer development is critical for a festival of this nature.
>
> mm: I think that leadership is simply the position that you are in because you've empowered other people around you. And that everyone who is responsible to a larger group of people has to continue to empower those people in order for there to be any work that gets done. And so that's the only distinction that I make with regard to leadership, is having the ability to empower other people.
>
> ii: Leadership to me is empowering others to be leaders.

---

[187] I do not mean to imply that I am aware of any such mechanism, because I am not.

On the other hand, it is less clear that "delegating" implies any impact on, change to, or sharing of the power position of the person doing the delegating:

> ee: if it becomes a priority, do something about it, then you can sort of delegate the job away... Sometimes there's a fine line between being too heavily involved and trying to do too much yourself, and delegating it down to the person who can do the job. I'm working pretty hard right now, in January, to get some of the decisions which have already been made off of my desk and down to the people who can make them work.

However, no clear-cut distinction along these lines can be drawn; among other difficulties, there are multiple examples of descriptions of what seem to be delegating or empowering processes, in which neither term appears explicitly, or in which a third term, for example "teamwork", appears to designate a similar process[188]. Under which term or process should these be characterized?

> cc: it's important both to lead and motivate, but also to give freedom for people to develop their roles and their positions as they see fit and as part of a bigger team. And it's something where I've tripped up in the past, because of my own lack of time, and maybe experience, not knowing exactly the right place to draw the line between telling people the way that they SHOULD do it and advising them of the way that they CAN do it.

> gg: But what I plan on doing is, instead of [me] doing it all, to say ok, these are ideas - who wants to work on this, who wants to work on that. And then get 2 or 3 people working on committees, and have them come back to me and say, hey, this is what I've got, this is what I've done.

> dd: In a PERFECT world, the director of an event has someone in place to do absolutely every task there is associated with the event, and it's a full-time job

---

[188] In the quote from "nn" with which this section begins, the "team" process is described as one which has a definite impact on the power position (the "job description") of the leader.

> keeping those people doing those tasks communicating with each other effectively

Using this data, then, delegation and empowerment cannot be separated; both are here employed as processes in which the two faces of leadership, interpersonal skills and the ability to organize, are used to obtain commitment and to channel or structure motivation.

> dd: you set a tone of openness, but of a directed openness, so that you're always CHANNELING people to think of new ideas but then, to use the system in order to incorporate them...

> ii: if I were to define leadership in my own role, that's how I would define it, by empowering leadership throughout the organization, with individuals at whatever level they're at, and making sure that there's assignments, or directives, or support for them to be leaders in their own way.

In the continuum posited in the mainstream literature between direction and participation, delegation is near the "highly participative" end of the scale; in the original, and still quoted, formulation by Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958), delegation is ranked above joint decision-making by leader and subordinates, and below complete abdication of responsibility on the part of the leader[189]. There is no consensus in the managerial literature as to a single or best definition of empowering. The fact that a precise definition was not offered by any of the interviewees is not a surprise in this light; what amounted to a confusion of terms only mirrors the imprecision offered by both the academic literature and the popular press.

Aside from the blurring of the terminology used, however, it was clear that the range of leadership styles, especially in respect to relations between the leader and staff and between the leader and volunteers at the level of coordinator, is much more compressed than

---

[189] Bass does not question the logic by which complete abdication of responsibility on the part of the leader is posited as the endpoint of participatory leadership and as the starting point on the "motivation to manage" scale. But then, judging by his prescription, under "Special Tactics for Women", that "Learning how to befriend, give, and receive help from men without letting it become a sexual encounter is important" (1990:736), his capacity for irony may be limited.

that described in the traditional literature as ranging from autocratic to egalitarian. Festival directors emphasize a range of styles which are decidedly participative, and which display a span from limited delegation to leadership by consensus. Whether it is called teamwork, delegation, empowerment, or "having an impact", descriptions of meaningful participation by stakeholders in determining some aspect of the festival are linked with outcomes which in turn range from a high level of commitment and motivation on the part of staff and volunteers to, in several places a sense of *ownership* and of *growth* on the part of these stakeholders.

> ii: I think as a manager my responsibility is to make sure that we produce the best festival, within budget and a quality event. And for me and my philosophy, as far as management is, the best way you do that is that you have ownership or input from the stakeholders. Who are the stakeholders? First of all they're the staff, the volunteers, the board.
>
> nn: I'm constantly evaluating my interaction with people, what I can be doing to ASSIST anyone of these people, and am being clear, and the importance of goals, and accomplishing goals for your staff, and I DEMAND initiative. And I demand that people begin to take ownership.
>
> bb: my style of management is delegation. As much as I can delegate and give the festival back to the volunteers, the happier I am, the happier, actually, THEY are - they LIKE to feel in control of the festival.
>
> oo: what happened... was a claim of ownership, an ownership of the project which is now going to be ongoing. And I think that when you look back at a piece of work that has used collaboration, and if it takes off, then that's what you end up with, you end up with a very collectively powerful piece of work that's going to have an afterlife. That's what's happened with this festival.

As noted above, meaningful participation by the shareholders is often contrasted to notions of hierarchy; in focusing on delegation and empowerment it becomes clear that hierarchy is seen as opposed to both personal growth and to the growth of the festival:

aa: Festivals have a tendency to start small, get bigger and bigger and bigger. In order to do that, because of lack of funds, you're dependent upon a group of individuals from the community. And eventually, although I think leadership is important, what happens is you've got to start delegating and you allow the community or your volunteer base, or however you work it, to take ownership of segments of the entity.

ii: I think that if somebody in management or somebody who has the responsibility of supervision doesn't release and share information that empowers others, then power is held just in one place. And that's not growth to me.

bb: It's hierarchical, they were afraid to let it grow.

oo: The old hierarchical models, they sit there and people don't GROW in it. Also people don't get to be as creative in the old models... because in a hierarchical model you don't have that challenge nor do you have the reward.

It will be seen below that notions of growth are central concerns of festival leadership and that that growth is envisioned in, primarily and of necessity, a decentralized fashion.

While traditional models of participation, again as was noted above, have ranked delegation as more highly participative than joint decision-making by both leader and subordinates, the festival directors tended to place "consensus" at the endpoint of the continuum, making both delegation and empowerment less extreme forms of participative leadership. Several directors did use the term "consensus" to describe their leadership style, but of those all but one qualified their usage at some point with talk of limitations to participation.[190]

oo: it's been much more successful THIS year than other years because we didn't try for consensus with every decision, as we have in other years... And when we tried to have consensus with [last year's] group, all sorts of power struggles kept happening. But I

---

[190] Even among those who did *not* make any reference to consensus, limits to participation - while varied - were almost universally noted.

think having set it up THIS way THIS year, people were allowed to take responsibility for certain things without having to come to consensus with everything. We collaborated.

kk: We operate HERE... as a collective - we have no boss. Even our board/staff structure is one of collective cooperation between us, so our decision making is not a hierarchical process, it is consensus... I work with the volunteers to develop their sense of achievement, their sense of participating in the process... I DO that specifically by empowering them to take decisions themselves, within a certain confine of course.

bb: Leadership- well, I think the first thing I look at [is] consensus. And the model of the Festival is we're volunteer-driven... So the first thing I look at is consensus, and in order to do that, I've had to learn to become a listener... So, delegation, shared consensus, listening - but we do have, to a point, a hierarchical structure. I mean, when push comes to shove, I'm the boss on a staff level. We're open to a lot of ideas. They pay me the most, so we work on that level, too. But it works very much on consensus.

dd: our festival is about accessibility, our festival's about empowerment, it's about education... you approach each decision that comes your way with those tenets in mind... you do that by bringing the people in who are going to be affected by that decision... And you take that input. You don't deny the fact that ultimately the decision rests with the leader...
[my approach is] not completely consensus... because I do believe, in order to move, you have to be able to say "no."

The limits to participative leadership become even more obvious when directors' comments turn specifically to the larger group of volunteers, ranging for some festivals up to 6,000 in number. It is certainly true that there are symbolic aspects of the participative approach taken with volunteers at the level of staff: directors talk about the need to use the "'we' word" in the festival environment; about the need for staff and volunteers to "buy in" to that image; about the need for people to "feel" (rather than to "be") part of the solution. In discussions around the main corps of

volunteers, however, the role of the symbolic leader, or the leader as figurehead[191] is more frequently and more directly emphasized. This role is often discussed in association with the maintenance of a coherent and effective organizational culture, itself described as an essential component of the successful festival.

> cc: in the bigger picture of leading the whole crew of volunteers... I think their perception of me as leader is more important than any interaction which I might have with those individuals... to the larger group of volunteers, I might be perceived more as a figurehead
>
> cc: If you look at the big crew, the whole group of volunteers, what I try to inspire is more the spirit than the details of the work. And the image of the event...
>
> hh: I've always been a strong believer in having get-togethers... We'll do some kind of group social thing together, it loosens up the tension and makes it feel like we're having fun together, not just working so hard. We try to keep the atmosphere in here FESTIVE, because I feel if WE'RE not having fun, our PRODUCT won't be any fun.

Stakeholders (2): Insiders and Outsiders (Boards, Agencies, Staff)

> cc: you know, talking about leadership here, trying to analyze some of the different components, it's interesting to remember how many hats we wear... [But] I think even though you change hats, I mean, maybe that is all you are changing. You know, the basic costume remains the same.

An awareness of multiple roles is evident in the division of approaches to volunteers at different levels; this multiplicity is even more pronounced when the directors' comments turn to other stakeholders in the organization. The mention of *outside agencies*, for example, brought into the discussion references to the symbolic function of the director as "carrying the image" of the event; to the liaison duties of the director, making the necessary connections with the host of

---

[191] As described by Mintzberg (1973).

organizations in various sectors with which a festival must coordinate; to spokesperson and negotiator roles with funding bodies, media, and contractors.

> cc: I think it's also important to be perceived by outside agencies as the leader of the organization, as being in control, and running a fairly tight organization, or fairly well-managed organization, and to be perceived as the one contact person with the Festival, whatever the title is, producer or manager or whatever. I think that's quite important.

> hh: as the front person of the festival you are responsible for promoting the festival and selling the image of the festival to the general community, so you do have to represent it in the best possible light. And that means wherever you are in public, you have to look right, talk right, think right, and all of that, you're always carrying the image of the festival around with you. People see you as the point person, so to speak, and you have to represent it properly

> ff: we're making it more and more receptive to the commercial end of the market, and I'm bringing in more sponsors all the time. This is how we're going to achieve self-sufficiency, is through corporate funding. I do the funding... and with my other hat, I also look after public relations.

> ee: But one of the other things about my job is I'm not only responsible for production but I'm also responsible for marketing and that's explaining what your priorities are. And again, that's where the leadership role comes out.

The *board of directors*, as alluded to at the beginning of this section, is regarded by some directors as a "tame" body of volunteers to be managed and by others as a management group to whom they are accountable. And the composition of boards varies in fact, from those composed of former front-line volunteers to those whose members are corporate officers or municipal leaders with representative interests that extend beyond the immediate interests of the festival. Perhaps an indicator of the varied status given to boards of directors may be found in the fact that nearly half of the people interviewed did *not* refer to their board. Directors who did mention their respective boards described roles that they took as, first, that of leader,

in the sense used by Mintzberg: motivating and developing volunteer board members. Other roles which took on prominence in the relation to the board were those of liaison, disseminator and entrepreneur, providing the board with external connections, information and innovations[192].

> bb: The board is the policy-making arm of the festival. Naturally, as the head of the staff here, they will look to the staff and to me to come forward with ideas, because I'm the professional in the business and I go to see other festivals, and we copy things and we start new initiatives. But if I propose something and it WASN'T accepted, I'd have to seriously question why they were doing that, and they quite possibly could be right, because COLLECTIVELY the board has a lot of experience on the festival.

Relations with *staff*, as mentioned earlier, are in the main congruent with those between directors and volunteers at the coordinator level. The emphasis on participation and ownership on the part of the volunteers is in large measure driven by the need to obtain a commitment for labour from this group without promise of financial return; a similar emphasis is most often necessary in the relation between director and staff because of a limited financial return, a limited term of employment, or both.

> nn: I also feel really strongly about... each person [having] a sense of location and of ownership, ...because we constantly contract people - there's only two and a half full-time employees - there's constant contract people and I'll come in, and I'll sit them down and... First of all I'll say, what do you want out of it? Because, to me, the [end is] I can't compensate with money, so the only thing they can compensate is with experience...

That status ambiguities obtain between staff and volunteers, however, is implied in descriptions of staff which vary in terms of the relative value given paid

---

[192] I was especially struck by the resemblances of much of the terminology and of the role descriptions used by the directors to those used in Mintzberg's work on managers; whether his work has filtered into the common parlance, whether his work *mirrored* the common parlance, or whether I simply tend to "hear what I know", seems to me to be an open question.

expertise and unpaid commitment - especially longterm commitment:

> ee: I've been lucky that I've had a good team working with us. At the moment I've got a very small planning team and they will be setting the basic foundations of what we're trying to do ...they've got a lot of autonomy, but the volunteers, some have been around a long time and they're quite happy to stick with the stuff that had been done twenty years ago. One of the challenges that we really have is to move them in a different direction... because the community has definitely changed, and you've got to go with that change.

> dd: We had, this year, a new person on staff, it was her first year, and we had a LOT of pre-meeting discussions 'cause sometimes even her questions that she was posing... we'd go, "Well, where does that come from?" because that's jarring to us... I KNOW that when she brings it up in the meeting, we're gonna get the hackles up, and all these volunteer team leaders, who know more than she does at this point about the event because they've been there for five years - no they haven't been paid, but, regardless.

Particularly revealing in this regard are the comments made by the leadership of one particular festival who work, and who were interviewed, as a collective. The collective takes the form of a steering committee in directing the festival. Work as a member of the collective is voluntary; the collective each year hires paid staff who work on limited contracts and who answer to and work with the steering committee. It appeared to me that staff were invited as a matter of course to take part in the interview I conducted with the collective.

In opening the discussion of leadership, the first speaker referred to the staff as "the CRITICAL organizers and in essence leaders at some level." That the staff participated in the running of the festival on a footing of status and autonomy which was equal to that of the members of the steering committee was expressed - explicitly, through anecdote, with humor, by contrast, often, at length and with feeling - throughout the interview. Staff were described, and described themselves, as respected, as autonomous, as free to participate, as equal and supported, and as facilitators. Some insight into the vehemence with which the

staff/steering committee theme was expressed might be gained from a comment which came late in the interview:

> oo: I can't help but keep comparing, but in last year's festival, it often felt like this staff was bullying the steering committee. Bawling us out, making us feel guilty for not doing enough, and then by the end, I think, the staff felt bullied, because everybody was dumping all their responsibilities, and the festival fell on their shoulders.

The element which is emphasized in the comparison of one year's staff with another has been called in the literature on leadership "leader-follower exchange quality" or "leader-member exchange" (LMX) after the model by Graen and colleagues which places on a continuum, from low to high quality, the individual relations, or exchanges, between leaders and subordinates[193]. Recent work looking at this model purports to demonstrate that high-quality exchanges are associated with perceptions, on the part of the leader, of attitudinal similarity between leader and follower[194]. In the festival environment, where professionalism and community ownership must constantly be kept in balance, a thorough understanding of the sensitivity of the equation of paid/unpaid, professional/amateur - as that equation has been formulated for that particular festival[195] - is one of the key dimensions of attitudinal similarity, and one of the requisite characteristics for full-fledged admission to the management team.

Staff working as members of the festival management team are themselves expected to function as bearers of the organizational culture or philosophy. Several factors combine to make the transmission of a specific organizational culture appropriate in the "festival industry"[196]. First, the external environment of the

---

193 Most recently Graen and Wakabayashi (1994).

194 Phillips and Bedeian (1994).

195 In the comments of "ee" above, as well as in his comments quoted earlier, the valuing of professionalism over commitment and staff over volunteers can be easily discerned; this is correspondent to the festival organization in question, which relies less on volunteers and more on admission prices and professional entertainment and is not strictly classifiable as a non-profit organization.

196 Several directors referred to the existence of a "festival industry"; some connected it to a larger

festival organization tends to be unstable and unpredictable. Second, the internal structure is most often flat and decentralized, focusing, at the management level[197], on non-routine tasks. Third, most festivals are non-profit and the vast majority of the labour in the "industry" is unpaid. Fourth, the "product" of the festival tends to be a form of entertainment which is imbued quite emphatically with a specific philosophy[198]. In successful festivals, as a result, the organizational culture which predominates is less market- than clan-oriented, and less focused on economic externalities than on social and political influences[199].

The ambiguity in the status of the staff, relative to that of volunteer workers, is a reflection that the opposing tensions, professional/ egalitarian, paid/ unpaid, are key aspects of the culture which must be managed by the leader. In the festival organization the leader functions as transmitter of a culture of equality, participation and commitment while at the same time he or she must depend to an enormous extent on a small team of staff who are usually temporary, who are usually poorly-paid in relation to a comparable job in private industry, but who usually *are* paid for work which does not differ significantly from the work done for nothing by a senior volunteer. It is no wonder, then, that several directors seemed to lay particular importance on their relations with their staff:

> ii: I think as a manager my responsibility is to make sure that we produce the best festival, within budget, and that could be considered a quality event. And for me and my philosophy, as far as management is, the best way you do that, is that you have ownership, if I may, or input from the stakeholders. Who are the stakeholders? First of all they're the staff, the volunteers, the board.
>
> dd: because I have a sort of hierarchy of loyalties, and depending on the issue, I'm gonna be backing my

---

"culture industry", others to the "business of entertainment."

[197] At the level of the front-line volunteer, the task is often routine and fairly well-structured.

[198] This idea is expanded below in the discussion of the theme of *vision*.

[199] Kerr & Slocum (1987); Ouchi (1981); Bass (1990)

staff, I'm gonna be backing my artists, I'm gonna be backing my volunteers, I'm gonna be backing my community, if I can.

dd: I have that concern over maintaining a support system around me that says even when I make a decision that isn't pleasant, they'll back me, and I'll back them

ll: I'm a good - probably the thing I'm best at, is casting. (laugh). So I have, I have a very good team of people who I've been able to bring together and have stayed with me over the years... I tend to get a lot of outside credit for what I do and I appreciate that very much but I'm the first one to hand it over to the team of people who help me. Because they are extraordinary.

Stakeholders (3): Envisioning the Artist and the Community

More than half of the directors interviewed referred to, as stakeholders, the *artists or performers* associated with their festivals; and the mentions made of artists parallel in important ways references to *community*. Although in several of the interviews "the artist" was not explicitly discussed, all of the festivals employ[200] artists in a greater or a lesser capacity. As the artist in each festival differs, so differs the relation between artist and festival: the Jazz festival might send a stretch limousine to escort an artist from the airport to his[201] suite of rooms in the city's best hotel; one of the dancers at the Multicultural Festival is likely to have been escorted the few blocks from Windsor Park School to Hawrelak Park by her mom, who also made her dress; one usually escorts oneself, without ever meeting an artist, through the visual art installations which animate the downtown core during The Works.

bb: We want to be excellent in every area. We always want to improve and we want to be as good as we can be. I feel that if you want to get the best artists,

---

[200] Admittedly, in one case the "employment" of the artist is, some years, indirect: the Black Heritage Month celebration does not showcase a living artist as part of its festivities every year, although the work of Black artists is always included in some capacity.

[201] Almost always.

you're probably going to have to, in an entertainment setting which is very capitalist in terms of what people make money-wise - the star system - then you're going to have to pay more money. So, we're constantly trying to increase our artistic budget and trying to hold the line in other areas

aa: And [this] scene, like most festival scenes is always under-financed, and what you're doing is, you're begging and scrounging on every level, including for your performers. So most performers will come to a festival for a lot less than they'd come to a concert for. And... we recognized that and honoured their participation - 'cause we knew we couldn't do it with money - by offering them respect and hospitality and a memorable time. They weren't treated as commodities - Glad you're here, get up on stage, uh, see you around... And I think that this festival has succeeded, beyond my wildest dreams, and the reason for it is because of THAT philosophy, of treating them with respect and dignity, and giving them the opportunity to be as good as they can be, within the most positive kind of performing circumstance.

aa: Anyway, I called the woman there who's in charge, and said, listen. And she said, oh yeah, we know that concept, it's a great concept, we don't have any money. So I said, well, you know, you're promoting a shopping centre as opposed to really caring about [these] performers, that's really where it's at (laugh). And she said, yeah, that's kind of true. Well, anybody that's got any passion for their art form, whether again it be poetry or sculpture, it doesn't matter. If somebody offers that kind of an opportunity, even if you have to turn it down, you consider it. You try and figure out a way to MAKE it happen, and they don't care.

As the relation between artist and festival varies, so too does the relation between festival and community. While it is true that the *audience* changes from festival to festival, the relation between festival and *community* is constituted by more than entertainment preferences and demographics. In the most straightforward conceptualization, "community" is used to refer to the local neighborhood which, in the case of some of the larger festivals, withstands a tremendous impact in terms

of crowds, noise, litter, traffic and economic benefit - or cost - during the run of the festival:

> dd: And we also have a huge economic impact, certainly... because you get [NAMES THE ATTENDANCE] in an area, and the economic impact is bigger than Christmas - that's a quote. It's in the restaurants, of course. Yeah, it is bigger than Christmas in restaurants- not for all stores. You can bet [NAMES A SPECIFIC BUSINESS] doesn't do a bang-up [business] - all her regular customers are gonna go, "Whoa! I'm not going down to that mess! I'll wait till (laughs) after the [festival] is over and come back." But, directly and indirectly - the people who come down here and then return again - the health of this whole community has been affected, very much, by what the [festival] has accomplished.

A second level of community envisions the group of people throughout the city, and beyond, who are united by the art form, the heritage, the politics or the philosophy celebrated by the festival[202]. When the director of one of the area's film festivals talks about "the community", she isn't concerned with the neighborhood in which the festival takes place but with another group, almost equally specific though more disbursed:

> nn: [The festival's parent organization] does not have a lot of money. And my goal is not create a bureaucracy. My whole goal is to get the money that I raise out to the community. So for instance the [x] program costs forty thousand to produce, nineteen thousand of that goes directly to the film community. I hire them as industry resource people for training. So, the turn over is really important to me and that there's an indirect benefit to the community.

Some directors envision this level of community, the group of people united by their art, history or ideas, as extending beyond the immediate geographic reaches of the festival, to encompass western Canadian, national, North American or global members: The Dreamspeakers Festival, for example, is international in scope, bringing together First Nations participants from Argentina to Zimbabwe. A second disbursed group, united in their interests at

---

[202] Most often, in fact, festivals celebrate some combination of these.

least from the viewpoint of the festival directors, is that encompassed by "the business community."

> dd: I found the business community is surprisingly similar to our own... There's a professionalism in what we do, so in terms of discussing that with business partners, or potential business partners, there's no real conflict there. There's quite an understanding on their part...
>
> mm: there's this blend of the artistic, creative process with the community, the art makers, and then the business community, which are also creative - they have to be. They have to recognize THEIR role as leaders, if they make selections of a certain nature, that they are affecting not just the business that they are doing day-to-day in the community, but the community [itself].

The third level of "community" is that of a mythic community: the community which is to be touched, formed or transformed by the festival. A festival is, as one of the directors notes below, traditionally a celebration of place. In a world fragmented by multiple and conflicting identities, and rejoined by information technologies, unparallelled mobility and mass communication, this "place" is increasingly a social creation. In the concept of community at this level, as it is given voice by the director, is found a key articulation of the festival's, or the leader's[203], *vision*.

> dd: and THAT'S why we're here, is to create a healthier, more globally-thinking community, and the only way you do that is to affect them very personally and remind them that they've got neighbours right next door... and that's another reason our festivals are so successful, is because there's an embracing quality that transcends the urbanization, [the] anonymity...
>
> bb: People don't knock on the door like they did in the fifties and say, "Johnny, come out to play," because mommy's afraid and daddy's afraid that we don't know who Johnny's dad is and we don't know what's going on. We're just more nuclear, we're more insular, so the more community events where people can

---

[203] The degree to which the central vision of the festival is the vision of the director is taken up below under *stages*.

share like that, and go with your parents and build a sense of history... I think that's a real benefit ...

aa: and we're in a strange time in our history, I think, sociologically, relative to communities. And cities, and people's alienation, and the whole business of people staring at their television sets most of the year. And the expense of various things, whether it be crap like [mentions, with a certain flair for slander, several expensive entertainment options]. Entertainment seems to be very important to people, and I'm not sure whether it's entertainment as much as it is the opportunity to interact with their community, and various peoples in their community. 'Cause even in Edmonton, which is a relatively isolated small place, you've got a lot of impersonality happening on the street ... so I think the opportunity of people to celebrate a sense of place is very important and that's sort of what a festival TRADITIONALLY has been about.

mm: I'm proud of what we do in Edmonton, I'm proud of everyone of us who work on a major public event like this and who have an interest in maintaining some type of quality of life, for the community, which is one motherhood statement... And we actually sit down as a group of people and talk about who our community is, who our family is that's helping get this thing done, this thing being all these projects we do and the [festival] being a public focus for it... Oh, it's a huge community; it's a huge community that's sort of in constant motion... that's what makes it exciting - keeps it pretty vital. And then of course, there's this blend of the artistic, creative process with the community, the art makers, and then the business community

(Super)Vision

> The Works is vitally interested in artists as leaders. The Works intends to enable our participating artists to exercise and express their gift of leadership. These artist/leaders owe people space; space in the sense of freedom and space to grow to be ourselves, to exercise our diversity. We all need to give each other space so that we can exchange ideas, openness, dignity, joy, healing, disparity, pain, suffering, inclusion, grace and beauty. (Message from the Artistic Director, 1993)

The majority of the directors interviewed voiced some measure of involvement in a vision for their festival. Perhaps most predictably, the artform celebrated by the festival often took precedence in the director's vision:

> cc: my love for the [artform] came first... You need just a total belief in the [artform] and the art of what we do. Rather than the business. You have to have faith that goes beyond the details of organizing an event.

> bb: and I saw the magic that was created by festivals... the people, the zeal and the enthusiasm, people working for the art of what they're doing, not concerned about whether they have a window in their office or if they got a new desk or a computer

This version of vision focused on the director's passion for the artform, incorporating a vocabulary of vision centering on love, faith, motivation, and drive:

> aa: So maybe a book on leadership might in retrospect fit the profile of festival coordinators, or producers, or whatever they are. Ah, but I don't think leadership is motivation. I think the motivation usually has to do with an almost unstoppable drive to accomplish whatever it might be. Whether it might be presenting the world's best folk music or whether it means bringing in international talent to a place, focusing on jazz, or in our case...

> bb: but generally, if I'm not excited about this job, get the hell out. And that's the beauty of it, we get paid for something that we love.

This dimension of vision is portrayed as emotional and instinctual, rather than rational or intellectual. The director's involvement at this level is described as constituting in itself a creative endeavor:

> aa: musicians, and poets, and sculptors, or any creative energies are usually channelled by compulsion, more than intelligence - you almost have to do it, you know what I mean?

> mm: everything I'm doing is for myself. It's like making art - each step or action is like making a mark in in a work of art. So I don't see that there's much separation between what I do and art-making

Offered as proof of the need for passion in order to create a viable festival, were examples in which the failure of passion, the lack of vision, meant the failure of a festival. In ways analogous to the use, highlighted earlier, of "hierarchy" as diametrically opposed to personal growth and organizational flexibility, in these examples "bureaucracy" is posited as incapable of possessing or generating vision; passion by committee is portrayed as inconceivable:

> ll: one of the things that we find most heartbreaking is that the festival in [x] this year has floundered. And been cancelled. And I think that's a function of another bureaucracy running a festival. When the management changed, the commitment to the festival changed. [What was lacking was] a sense of commitment and a real vision for the festival.
>
> ll: I think that really, you need one person with a vision of what it could be an, then, if that person can rally enough people behind them in the community, that's what'll make the festival work. It's very hard to have a festival that's put together by a committee, or a bureaucracy, or anything like that.
>
> bb: [talking about a larger, hierarchical, institution, in contrast to the festival organization] [You find] people who are put in because of political appointments rather than their experience and their ability to do the job, that's the first thing. Secondly, ...people who are more caught up in the politics of a job than actually doing it... a lot of powerbrokers... I didn't find the dedication to their art or to the artists that was a strong and artistic vision. I didn't feel there was any artistic vision down there really.

An exception to the dictum that passion and vision are not producible by committee is offered in the example of the "visioning committee" of the festival run by a collective. In their description of the successful establishment of a vision by committee, the collective seem to indicate that central to their success was the strict division of "visioning" or "dreaming" from implementation and "practicalities":

> oo: we went through a really clear process right [from] the beginning, starting from that initial

> visioning committee. We started with a committee that just dreamt about the festival, and that was all the work that was assigned to them. Which started this festival off, I think, in a very positive way. And those people didn't have to commit to organizing it, they just had to dream about it. We then hired a fundraiser to record that and also to start the fundraising process. So, when we started our working committee, we started with some tools in place already. We started with some of those dreams that we could start to put into budgets and work in terms of practicalities, and then the process from there became a real working process. I mean, we weren't dreaming anymore...

This version of "visioning" bears a resemblance to group brainstorming processes, regarded by the mainstream literature - just as 'vision by committee' is viewed by some directors here - as largely ineffective[204]. In contrasting their approach to an approach dictated by hierarchical arrangements - just as do the directors quoted above - the collective itself offers what are perhaps the requisite circumstances which make collective visioning possible:

> oo: I think what's so interesting about collective or collaborative work is that it requires a great deal of emotional maturity in some ways. The old hierarchical models, they sit there and people don't GROW in it. Also people don't get to be as creative in the old models. And I think that's what so interesting about this kind of a model - when it works - is that it really calls on you to be emotionally stable... It's kind of a synergistic thing, that the more you are, and the people at the table are, able to be healthy and wise and work well in that way, the more we get back. And that there's so much more room in this kind of a model for people to be healthy - creatively, emotionally, all the different levels of health that there is... This model gives so much more room for... feeling good about yourself, and feeling energized by everybody else's strength, right?

While Bouchard, Barsaloux and Drauden investigated the relation of group size and sex to the lackluster

---

[204] Widely cited research by Bouchard, Barsaloux and Drauden (1974) demonstrates that individuals are far more productive and creative than groups.

creative performance of brainstorming groups, they did not attempt to control for "emotional maturity" or any such 'softer' measure in their research[205].

In most cases, the vision based on passion for the artform was coupled with a broader vision encompassing social justice or social change:

> ll: We're passionately committed to our festival. I don't know if you've seen our materials - our mission statement is to change the world by surrounding [people] with excellence so that they'll go on to demand excellence from the rest of their lives.
>
> mm: it's just locking on to that same central truth, which is we're here for a bigger purpose - it's very much a spiritual thing (laughs)... we're here to do something collectively... humanity is something that we all have a responsibility to care for, and the well being of all human kind, and that, no matter what our actions are, that's our job here... So what I'M saying is what turns us on, here, collectively... is the artist that makes the selections for more than themselves... And I think that's reflected in artwork that is created, not just for its own sake, we're sort of beyond that movement, but artwork th 's [being] created for a certain place in time, in response to the environment and the community that's interacting with the art.
>
> dd: it is far more holistic and it has to do with the health of a community, and it's the first step in getting a healthy community, is understanding who your neighbours are, and how to talk to them, and how to listen to them... [This] metaphor says, "Leap into this imagining place"... And when you come out of that experience, if it's worked, even if it's only partially worked, you're not the same individual. You've had to respond somehow to that perspective... if you keep exposing yourself to that sort of thing... further on down the line... you're at a point where you start making educated, informed decisions on things. And by that I mean a more holistic vision of the world... that's why we're here, and that's our

---

[205] In more recent research, electronic brainstorming has been promoted as a means of bypassing the fears of being criticized which are hypothesized to inhibit creativity in traditional brainstorming groups (Gallupe, Bastianutti, and Cooper, 1991).

vision of a world, is a world where we can at least affect one another, influence one another, talk to one another.

bb: another leadership role: with the festival, we try and build not just great [artform], which we think we're achieving, we try and make it kind of a society, as how we would like society to operate. Therefore, it's very important to us how persons in wheelchairs are treated. We have a whole access crew... We've implemented a hard-of-hearing FM system, so that people who are hard-of-hearing can come down... We give away, now, [x number of] day-passes to social service agencies...

In the discussions with at least a third of the directors interviewed, the passion for social change was such that the artform or artforms showcased by the festivals were clearly second in importance to the reigning philosophy, whether that philosophy was depicted as belonging to the festival or to the director.

nn: I also think it's really important, I feel really strongly, that people are supported... I was born and brought up with, and practised Christian Science, which is the sense of each person being completely whole, and with infinite potential. And I practice what I believe in... It's really interesting that I got a letter from a staff person I'm working with now... and he said that, working in [this] environment had touched him to parts of himself that he really liked but had forgotten he'd had. And that's wonderful! You know, in a way, I don't care what happens to [the festival] 'cause I really, that's my goal. And in fact, if you think about [it], the goal of [the festival] is to celebrate the [artist]. So there's no hierarchy. [The festival] reflects my management - there's no hierarchy, there's no awards given. Everybody that we focus on is celebrated.

kk: You know what the theme of our festival this year is? [kim: No.] Challenging the new world order...

kk: I set the philosophical framework for the festival and that is my role as a facilitator and as a leader as well. The festival comes from a certain context, from an organization, from a history; we are attempting to do more than just a festival, celebrating international cooperation... As soon as I

> say that the festival is more than just [artforms] and stuff - it IS a celebration - but it is also a vehicle for developing a network for social change. ... that part of the festival comes from the philosophical framework, which is very clear in my mind WHY the festival exists. Ah, it's not just to watch beautiful films, or to look at art for art's sake.

There was not a clear association of 'philosophy as belonging to the director' with founding directors, nor of 'philosophy as belonging to the festival' with directors stepping in to run an extant festival. In the second example above, the speaker (kk), who is not the founder of the festival, both "sets" the philosophy and pays attention to its historical origins. Because the director, again, is often the only permanent member of the organization, it does not seem surprising that a certain blurring of the boundaries between festival philosophy/identity and personal philosophy /identity should take place - or, as one director put it, that the festival "takes on very much the personality of the director" is "unavoidable at most times".

In several of the cases in which the vision articulated seemed very much the personal vision of the director, the interviewees said almost nothing about their festivals[206]. These directors focused their comments almost exclusively upon the vision of social justice which, in their view, was the reason the festival existed. These were the directors of festivals which showcased multiple artforms and focused on a specific culture of origin[207].

---

[206] This point, which horrified and dismayed me at the time, is taken up at the end of this chapter, and again in the next.

[207] It is important to note, first, that these festivals are usually referred to as "ethnic" festivals, which renders invisible the fact that the original agricultural festivals in Alberta, like most of the contemporary art festivals, are equally ethnically specific. They reflect the heritage, culture and interests of, predominantly, one group: white Anglo-Saxon Protestants. (The use of the word "ethnic" to refer to "non-white" was pointed out to me by one of the directors.) Second, not all of the directors of festivals which showcased multiple artforms and multiple cultures voiced visions in which social justice figured prominently.

ii: I come from a philosophy that I don't believe that anyone should be leaders unless we're all leaders... if I were to define leadership, in my own role, that's how I would define it, by empowering leadership throughout the organization, with individuals at whatever level they're at... Leadership to me is empowering others to be leaders. And I think that leadership generally sets up an hierarchial structure in the community and I think that perhaps that could be one of the greatest problems in society... And I don't think that coming in and taking on the old hierarchical, male-dominated way of managing works... I say we'd better revamp the... system. Whereby we have control, we the people, not out of greed, or any other reason, other than to make sure our basic needs are met. What is that? To me it's shelter, it's food, it's clothing, it's education, it's culture, it's art.

pp: I would consider myself a leader in the fact of bringing up the subject to consciousness... what [this festival] SHOULD be all about. If not necessarily what it is right now, but what it should be... saying, okay, this 1993 [festival] is over, when do we begin planning for 1994? What are we hoping to achieve? What will be our goal for 1994? ... For us [the festival] is particularly important, because I think it is a venue for us to bring out, to our community, that we have made some very VALUABLE and very important contribution to the world, right through history. That we have a past, we have a culture, we have a history that we should be proud of. And ALTHOUGH it is never taught in the schools, or it is hardly MENTIONED... you do have a history, and you should know the history, you should celebrate the history, and you should learn the history. And it's also bringing to the wider community, the fact that, yes, we have a past, we've made some meaningful contribution. We 've HAD some real meaningful achievement, that we are proud of. And we have role models, within our culture that we can emulate, we should be proud of.

qq: I'm consistent. I don't shift my position so much, whether I'm in the company of an all-white audience, or if I'm in the company of a mixed audience, or a company of all visible minorities, I would say the same kinds of things. I have come to be known as having a position, having a message which I

take with me... If a leader has a message, then, yes, I suppose to some extent I am one because I have a message, and I take that message with me everywhere I go. It has to do with dealing with [social problem], ending it, working towards [ending] it, looking at ways and means to end [it], whether it takes [names solution], whether it takes funding for a festival like [x], in every field, and in every sphere, yes that's the message I take with me.

Not every director can be said to have voiced a vision, or at least not a vision imbued with passion, as distinguishable from a goal statement at an operational level:

ff: in fact the ultimate goal, the long-range goal for this festival, [is] we're striving for self-sufficiency, i.e. being completely separate from any funding from government at any level, while still keeping admission free to the public.

ee: Yeah, there is a fairly strong leadership role which must be played. I think it's more and more so now, because everybody is in the entertainment business and that's basically what I'm in. You're competing for recreational time and recreational dollars and you have to be pretty firm and focused on where you're going and what does the job for you... Like I say it's tough out there to get people's time and recreational dollars, but a nice challenge, 'cause I think we all like a challenge.

It doesn't seem like coincidence that these speakers are both directors of festivals which do not belong to the arts festival association, which reportedly do not often align themselves with the arts festivals, and which are considered by at least some of the the arts festivals directors to follow a different mandate, one based on more on municipal policies and politics than on celebrating an artform. In fact, the first of the two speakers began the interview with a comment which, referring not to "goal" but to "belief", probably stands as his strongest statement of philosophy:

ff: I'm a staunch believer that actually EVERY festival should be treated as a business. Yes, we're in the entertainment business, if you will, and we're lending a cultural component to our own communities. By the same token, there's a tremendous economic spin-off as a result of organizing these festivals and in

order to stay IN BUSINESS, so to speak, you have to treat it as a business.

The contrast between this belief statement and that more typical of the arts festivals can be seen in the following quotes that one director read to me from the collection displayed above her desk. The first was anonymous:

ll: If you're not value-driven and you're working in the arts, you're working in the wrong place

And the second is a quote from Alice Walker:

ll: If art doesn't make us better, than what on earth is it for?

Stages: The Leader and Organizational Stages of Development

Every director spoke about structure in some guise, and most festival structures are similar, but a common element among several of the directors' comments was striking - this was the notion that a different sort of leader, with a different set of skills, was needed for the founding stage of the festival. Two directors in particular made much of this theme:

aa: I did a workshop a few years ago with a woman named [ll] who runs the [x festival] a couple of years ago, and it was on and for people who were thinking of initiating festivals, particularly in small towns, and were from all over Alberta. So she and I got together before the workshop to figure out what we were going to say, and we wanted to figure out what was necessary to start a festival. And we determined that the first thing that was necessary was one crazed individual. So it's just somebody who usually, for whatever their motivation, is determined, and almost compulsive about a vision that they have or an idea that they have and then they just make it happen.

ll: he and I had given many workshops and one of the ones that we gave was together and - we talked just about this question, about what it takes to put on a successful festival, and our answer was that it takes one crazed individual who won't take no for an answer.

This view, that it took one individual with an "almost unstoppable drive" to get a festival off the

ground was repeated in fairly similar terms by other directors as well. There isn't enough similarity, however, to determine whether this occurred as a result of the diffusion of the "one crazed individual" notion, or whether the "crazed individual" idea was simply a reflection of commonly held opinion. What is clear is the resonance between this expression of 'necessary attributes' of the founder and the literatures both of transformational versus transactional leadership and of the more heroic depictions of the entrepreneur[208].

> bb: But it works very much on consensus. Now the Festival's gone through different styles. The first general manager, I believe, that was here, would not have worked that way, and often in the growth of an organization, it takes one individual with a very strong vision to get a festival going. It's a real leap of faith, it's not an easy thing... But I wouldn't've been able to start this festival, I know that. That takes a person who's willing to bump and grind and get out there and raise sponsorship and start with nothing and possibly if there's a reward, monetarily, coming along, that was down the road...

That many founders of festivals work for little or nothing for the first several years is more than a 'founding' myth: several of the directors of smaller festivals of brief duration worked on a voluntary basis. One of the directors was working full time for a festival for no remuneration at the time of the interview; this person anticipated that funding for a temporary position at the time of the festival would bring in, eventually, what amounted to a small honorarium. This pattern is in fact typical of the founders of several of the major festivals, including the following speaker:

> aa: And the arts festivals usually are that crazed individual, or it's sometimes a small group of people - and they have a tendency, in my opinion, of course I'm a bit of a snob, to be more successful, because of that love that's put into it. It's not a bunch of

---

[208] In fact, these literatures overlap. The recent biographical depictions of, for example, Lee Iaccoca, "saving the day", Bill Gates, "from nerd to the richest man in the world", Steven Jobs, "the birth of Apple in a humble garage", all represent in great measure the value/valor of transformation over mere, everyday transaction.

professional administrators. I mean, most people that I know in the festival business who lead, work for anywhere from two to five or six years for almost nothing. So money isn't the motivating factor, I don't know if it's glory, or achievement, or just making happen a dream that you had.

The founder who overcomes, against all odds, innumerable obstacles to accomplish a dream is, in this type of account, a symbol of the passionate leader; that he or she labors without even considering remuneration is the very proof of passion.

aa: [because of the various places] the funding was coming from, the concept had to answer to a lot of different gods. So the idea was that they'd be partially performing arts, partially sports, partially recreation, partially just civic celebration. And none of them were attacked with any really great passion. It was more, here is this pot of money, how are we going to spend it. So, the first year... they had like nine hundred thousand dollars in cash and half of it went to administration. Well, the first year this festival ran, we only had a forty-six thousand dollar budget, but my contract was for four grand. So it was ten percent for administration, and these guys were spending fifty percent on administration. So, the people who have the passion, they don't care about the money 'n other people do.

As consistent as their disregard for money is the portrayal of the founders' disregard for obstacles and their fearlessness:

dd: [The founding director] was really good to work with, and yet, I believe [he] is very much a one-punch, "I got a vision and I'm going this direction and you guys can come or you can leave", and that's not me, necessarily. It's a different approach. His is a much more of a damn-the-torpedoes... I have that concern over maintaining a support system around me that says even when I make a decision that isn't pleasant, they'll back me, and I'll back them, etc., that sense of trust. I think that was less important to [him]. He just went "No, this is it." And that sort of energy is probably more effective in getting an idea off the ground. It sure as hell is faster. It's more dangerous, and it's more short-term. (laughs)

aa: And she came in like a bulldozer, man, and in two years she established that festival into a real entity. And she pissed a lot of people off and she made certain mistakes, but that's part of the process

kk: [the festival was started by] the creative genius of [x]. He's not coordinating festivals any more... (laugh) but he's someone that will shake up your mind! (laugh)

The personality of the founder received particular emphasis in the comments of those directors quoted above. The traits seized upon often seemed to be depicted in a larger-than-life fashion, and were obviously a part of the narrative heritage of the festival, as their stories were introduced in these, often brief, interviews sometimes years after their tenure with the festival had ended. Personality traits were not solely the provenance of the mythic founder: all of the founding directors interviewed referred to a greater or lesser extent to the relevance of their own personalities; the director who referred most consistently and insistently to various facets of his personality was not a founding director.

But there was a definite indication, in terms of a recurring theme, which associated an ability to adapt one's personality, to shift one's focus from confrontation toward consensus, as the festival reached a certain size and level of stability. In the most common situation, that is, in those festivals of which the director is the only permanent employee, the festival must move in effect from an entrepreneurial stage to a collective stage each year. As the festival matures and the corps of volunteers becomes more experienced, the festival might be seen to progress through what has been called the crisis of delegation and control[209]. As has

---

[209] Greiner (1972); Quinn and Cameron (1983). Although some of Edmonton's festivals are among the largest in North America, none can be said to have reached the stage of elaboration. This is not to say that a festival organization cannot reach this stage: older and/or more thoroughly institutionalized festivals, such as the Montreal or Monterey Jazz Festivals, or the Toronto Film Festival, might be said to have reached the elaboration stage, if not to have passed through a crisis or two of revitalization. Certainly some larger festivals have passed from maturity to decline: one interviewee voiced

been addressed above, the need for delegation/ participation/ commitment is particularly evident in the festival organization; especially in the case of those festivals which incorporate an element of social justice or social change in their vision, the position of the leader is described at times in terms of the stewardship, on behalf of the community, of a public entity.

> aa: USUALLY the germ of the idea comes from a small group or an individual person with this dream... And the public has supported it enormously. What's happened is you've got this volunteer CADRE of people who've been established within the community which gives the community real ownership of these events...
>
> bb: you have to encompass a vision for the festival, which has been slowly coming to me over the last few years. Everybody has different visions and part of my job is to hear those, maybe think of new ones, but to put that collective vision out [there] for that weekend. To, kind of, take it all in and be a processor
>
> ii: Serving, that's the bottom line. Leadership is serving, that's what it is to me. Serving the community, not serving oneself.

Method and Results: Evaluation of Racial and Gender Inclusiveness

In reviewing the questions developed in Chapter 2 as they pertained to this first phase of the analysis, it became clear that, while the first four questions were satisfied reasonably well by the selection of the subject group and the design of the research question, the last five questions had not been satisfied. The progression, noted in the second chapter, from the more global to more specific concerns, becomes problematic, in the light of the first part of the analysis, in terms of the final requirement at the level of methodology; that the method and the research situation are appropriate to the lived reality of the research subjects is doubtful. The method of the present analysis is shown to offer no recourse to the "barriers to understanding and to obtaining insider

---

the opinion that the Newport Jazz Festival had reached this stage.

information" erected by, in the most general terms, ingroup/outgroup differences.

The invalidation of the premise of the fifth question in the critique renders the subsequent points invalid as well. The evaluation of this phase of the analysis is described below in the form of responses to the questions developed in the Chapter 2 critique.

Question 1 (Neglected areas of research): *Are concerns of women and minority men, as leaders or as among those to be led, explicitly addressed?*

Question 2 (Focus on public, visible, dramatic): *Is the focus of the research directed toward high-profile individuals, or are less visible, less "public" persons included?*

Question 3 (Single society assumption): *Is the assumption made of a homogeneous subject group or are realities of race and gender included? What percentage of research subjects are women or minority men?*

The choice of festival directors as a subject group was made in an explicit attempt to hear voices most often excluded in the mainstream literature on leadership. The open-ended structure of the interviews was intended to allow the directors the opportunity to introduce and pursue their own interests and concerns as these pertained to the question of leadership. Although only the director was interviewed, the subject group in general terms is not one of the typical high-profile groups in organizational analysis. The impact of the "realities of race and gender" on the subject of leadership was specifically focused upon in the selection of the subject group and methodology. The research design thus appears to satisfy the first three points of the critique.

Question 4 (Assumption of gender neutrality): *Is there an assumption of race- and/or gender-neutrality in the theoretical base, in the research question, in the research situation and methods? Is this assumption valid?*

The assumption of race- and gender-neutrality in the extant, mainstream literature on leadership and in the findings of that literature is challenged by this work as invalid; the research question is intended to focus upon evidence - if such exists - that this purported neutrality is false and perhaps impossible. The situation and method were designed to invite polemic on the avowed neutrality of the question of leadership.

This point is satisfied in the structure and the substance of the critique developed in the second chapter. That this point is not reflected in the results of this first part of the analysis poses a certain ambiguity, which surfaces most clearly at the next point in the critique.

Question 5 (Methods and research situation unable to capture certain types of information): *Are the methods and the research situation appropriate to address the reality of women and minority men? What is the sex and race of the researcher, of the confederates? What are the implications of the research method for subjects who may lack status and/or legitimacy?*

Several facets of this question are not satisfied by the methods, the research situation, or both. The research situation was limited in important ways by the identity - in terms of sex, race, class, and sexual orientation - of the interviewer. It became apparent to me through comments made in several interviews that the interviewees saw my questions as potentially evaluative, from the perspective of "The Business School", of their management or of their organization; my status as a representative of both the academic and the business worlds was seen by some as at least potentially threatening to or de-legitimating of their status. From what I interpreted initially as my inability to "control" the direction of several interviews, it became apparent to me that my race, gender, and sexual orientation were salient to the research situation: I hated to have to admit to myself that three out of four of my most difficult interviews were those with subjects from whom I most differed in these terms.

If status asymmetries, culture and gender differences posed problems in the research situation, primarily during data collection, neither did the method of analysis employed offer anything to overcome the barriers to understanding erected by my identity as a heterosexual white woman from the school of business. In fact, the orthodox methodology by which data is subjected to conceptual coding and categorization, removed from its context and reorganized for presentation as "Results", assisted in the obfuscation of earlier barriers to understanding: from interviews during which I felt that I was not understanding the perspective of the speaker, I could pull quotations clearly referring to what I thought of as "stakeholders", "vision" and "stage of development", so why did I need to worry about a deeper

understanding? And who would know besides me that this was lacking?

As the premise in this question is not validated, the following points of the critique will not be satisfied. A brief evaluation of the remaining questions will demonstrate to what extent this is so.

Question 6 (Concrete experience as a criterion of meaning): *Is concrete experience, especially that of women and of minority men, a criterion of meaning? Is primary use made of field or laboratory research? Of contextually grounded or off-the-shelf instruments?*

Primary use was made of field research in order to attempt to focus on the concrete, lived experience of the interviewees. The method of analysis, however, although contextually derived according to the precepts laid out by the grounded theory approach, does *not* seem to satisfy the requirement that the experience of those interviewed serves as a primary criterion of meaning. This is true in spite of several aspects of the method: as many excerpts from the interview data as I believe the reader can bear have been included in the analysis, so that the data can 'speak for themselves'; the categories have been derived from the data and applied to the data; my understanding of the categories employed by the directors interviewed was enhanced by participant observation.

The problem can be conceived in terms of context, both positive and negative. In a positive sense, excerpts are presented *in* the context of categories I have derived and perhaps imposed; they appear as evidence. Conversely, excerpts by definition are taken *out* of their original context; missing is any sense of the place of these comments in the development of the original argument. Is the primary criterion of meaning therefore the experience of the speaker or that of the researcher?

Question 7 (Use of dialogue in assessing knowledge claims): *Does the researcher enter into a dialogue with subjects? Does the research make use of feedback from subjects? Are there opportunities for dialogue with competing models?*

Although there was a limited dialogue which took place between interviewer and interviewee, in the confines of the present methodology my comments as interviewer are neither encouraged not accommodated. Although a grounded theory-type approach is insistent about the recording of one's *internal* dialogue as an aid to critical reflection, the question of a dialogue with

subjects is traditionally discussed largely in the negative: the fear of "contamination" of subjects' responses dictates that the interviewer "must probe but remain neutral", "must be interested... but seem oblivious to the implications"[210], must encourage, paraphrase, and direct, but not really engage in, the conversation. An interview is not a dialogue; "an interview is a piece of social interaction with one person asking another a number of questions and the other person giving answers"[211]. Thus, I found myself despairingly analysing the transcriptions of my own comments and pencilling in the 'probes' I *should* have used, with the ideal firmly in mind of levitating through an interview, responding to any and every comment, from the startling to the inflammatory, with the beatific and inscrutable "Would you care to give an example of that?"

While the inclusion of "representative excerpts" is accepted practice[212] for demonstrating the valid derivation of categories from data, the use of this device as a means by which alternative interpretations of data becomes accessible (and thus dialogue between competing models becomes possible) is limited, perhaps to the point of being illusory. As indicated in the response to the previous question, the interpretation of the 'representative excerpt' is very carefully controlled by selection, editing and the context in which the excerpt is presented.

Feedback has not been solicited from subjects of the research at this point.

Question 8 (Ethic of caring)*: are any aspects of an ethic of care addressed? Is the role of individual expressiveness or of emotion addressed? Is empathy, as opposed to instrumentality, valued or given importance?*

The only accomodation of an ethic of care in the present methodology is the empathy of the interviewer for the subjects interviewed; this is traditionally seen as appropriate to secure the participation of the interviewee. At the same time, however, an overabundance

---

[210] From a description of "The Interview Experience" in *Doing Social Research*, a textbook for budding social scientists (Baker, 1988: 186).

[211] Baker, 1988:185

[212] The use of this device in an article published in *ASQ*, one of the premier legitimating institutions in the field, is an example of the acceptance of this practice: see Ely (1994).

of such empathy is seen as potentially dangerous to the objectivity of the interview. In anthropology this is referred to as "going native"; the connotation seems to be one of seduction. In business research, grounded as one must be in the concept of the maximization of utility, one tends to impute a more explicit instrumentality and think of it as "being coopted".

The use of the aggregating techniques inherent to the traditional social science approach devalue individual expressiveress and emotion in relation to commonalities of expression and emotion. Individual expression and emotion become fictions at the service of the researcher when they are decontextualized and rearranged so as to appear to mouth support for a theme which might be entirely foreign to their intent. In this part of the analysis, for example, the remarks made by several of the festival directors about empowerment and concern for the growth of the individual seem subtly transformed by the processes of coding, sorting and collating; "empowerment" and "growth" in this presentation appear much less likely to be concerns of the individual director than instrumental notions, ways of making the unwieldy, volunteer-driven organization work.

Question 9 (Ethic of personal accountability): *Is an ethic of personal accountability in evidence? Is any other dimension but performance, e.g. morality, addressed?*

This aspect of the critique, as the most dependent on the points which have gone before, is the least satisfactorily addressed. As noted in the response to Question 7, the voice of the interviewer is undefined in the present analysis, and in traditional analyses in general. Van Maanen, among others, argues for explicit attention to the role - the art and the craft - of the authorial voice; but from the perspective of an ethic of personal accountability, the art by which the voice of the author becomes, most often, cloaked in neutrality, in effect removes the emphasis from personal accountability and places it solely on the researcher's performance. In academic work, one is held far more explicitly and rigorously accountable for objective measures of performance than for any personal connection, moral or otherwise, to one's work; indeed, it has been argued that the investment of personal attachment to one's work is a liability and a weakness. What matters is not that one believes in one's work, but that one's work is seen to be performed according to an externally set standard.

It is at the level of personal accountability that I feel most unsatisfied with this phase of the analysis. Although I have included as many of the words of the directors interviewed as I feel the reader might bear, I have been aware throughout that the voices of the interviewees are not well represented by the themes highlighted in the analysis.

Nor is this concern for the inclusion of voice "merely" sentimental. As noted in the response to the last question, the decontextualization of remarks can bring about a shift in the quality or connotation of concepts: that which, at the individual level, expresses an act of personal conviction can appear, in the aggregate, as in fact acting in order to control. A prejudice toward an interpretation of instrumentality, for example, may well be the artifact of a method which, in aspiring toward objectivity, undervalues the individual. But the same dynamic which undervalues the subject of the research protects the author of the research; the more mechanical the coding and sorting, the more assured both reader and researcher can be that the author, if not infallible, is at least not personally responsible for the results.

A Personal Reflection

By the time I finished writing up the "third most often mentioned theme" of the analysis, I had come to think of the words of the festival directors as inert matter - a colorless, dense and unrewarding material which it was my unpleasant task to sculpt into some plausible shape. And although I found the shape which was emerging plausible enough, it had lost any resemblance to the shape of the experience I had had, working for festivals, taking part in festivals, and speaking at length with festival directors. These people's voices, in particular, had been lost in the process of analysis: the voices which emerged in the transcript excerpts I had so carefully coded, cleaned up, cut and pasted seemed falsified, caricatured. I had approached these people because they seemed as a group so innovative, expressive, dynamic, appealing - why then, in my analysis, did they sound so much like the fictionalized and two-dimensional women and men in a business textbook?

I ignored my discomfort for as long as I could, but it didn't really lessen. In fact, during a certain phase I found myself angry and disappointed - with *them*, the interviewees. How could they be so boring! How

frustrating! Strip away the music and the costumes and the rhetoric of the festival, and underneath - business as usual. I turned in desperation to thoughts of computerizing the analysis. This was the call to methodolatry: if I have to work with a material I have come secretly to despise, perhaps I can find carving tools to love.

Because I was considering 'dropping the data' into a qualitative analysis package, I spent some time contemplating what exactly would constitute the appropriate text unit, the minimum text segment which would constitute a meaningful unit of analysis. One day I broke a long passage of transcription into clauses and printed it out. Suddenly, I was no longer seeing "aa"'s self-serving monologue. Instead, I was watching as he picked up pieces of language and deliberately, spontaneously, with humor and skill, put together a patterned and fluid argument, the many facets of which reflected the two of us, his bright and chaotic office, the incipient thaw, the view of downtown, and the feeling of a Friday with a table booked for lunch. This wasn't the transcript I had come to know and loathe; this was performance art, and the reason I had thought to do this hopeless research in the first place. I was relieved to be able to admit at last that it was in fact something *I had done* which rendered the transcribed experience monochromatic and unmoving; I could admit it because I could begin to believe there was another way to look at the data, a way to re-present it with its voices, its colours and its purposes intact.

I didn't come to my affinity for the clause wholly without premeditation - I warned you in Chapter 1 that my background was in languages and literature. In my reading about discourse, I had long been drawn toward those analyses of texts which stayed close to the language used and avoided what Sayer called[213] "the violence of abstraction." Of all the discourse analysis I had read, I was most drawn to the work of Bakhtin, at a theoretical level, and to that of Halliday, and his functional grammar converts, in regards to an explicitly theorized methodology.

But I hadn't thought that I could *do* a functional grammar-type analysis, because it would be just too detailed; although more sociologically-oriented discourse

---

[213] In an almost totally unrelated context: he was talking about historical materialism. Sayer, 1987.

analyses, like those of Potter and Wetherell[214], had been used for lengthy interview data, most article-length analyses using close linguistic approaches worked with, for example, brief newspaper accounts, one-page advertisements, or short transcriptions of "naturally occuring" conversation.[215] But as I pondered several transcripts, re-organized on the basis of the clause as the unit of analysis, I thought about Bakhtin, and the possibility of using what he called "the utterance" as the level of analysis. And with this new-found view of method - close linguistic analyses of data segments the selection of which would be driven by Bakhtin's theory - I found myself embarking upon the second phase of the analysis.

---

[214] 1987; also Wetherell & Potter, 1988.

[215] see van Dijk, 1985, or any issue of *Discourse and Society*, or *Text*, both journals of discourse analysis.

CHAPTER 5

SECOND THEMES: METHODOLOGY

In the second part of the analysis the themes explored are those derived from a discourse analytic approach to the data. This approach focuses not only upon *what* is said, which was central to the analysis in the last chapter, but on *how* the speaker's comments are constructed. The analysis presented in this and the following chapter is focused on the segment of the interviewees' talk in which they responded to the question, "Do you think of yourself as a leader?" This analysis is presented in Chapter 6 in conjunction with the transcriptions of these segments, defined below as *utterances;* the analysis is closely keyed to the progression of themes as they appear in the speaker's comments. In this way, themes are first explored within the accounts of individual speakers; as the analysis proceeds from one account to the next, connections are made and themes are developed across accounts.

Rather than follow the abstract dictates of a predetermined method, the present methodology has been structured by the results of the critique of the first phase of the analysis. Thus this construction is described below in terms of the satisfaction of not only the traditional criteria of objectivity, reliability and validity, but also the criteria for non-sexist and non-racist research set out in the second chapter. Central to the satisfaction of criteria is the basing of this methodology in a more thoroughly theorized approach to the transcription and presentation of talk, to the segmenting of talk into utterances, and to the way in which talk is constructed.

That this explicitly theorized approach qualifies as "discourse analysis" is the subject of the following section; the difference between the present and a traditional approach, however, may be demonstrated in a brief look at the themes elicited in this second phase of the analysis. In this phase the analysis reveals two themes, in the comments of the festival directors, which were not apparent in the first phase and which differ qualitatively from the themes encountered in, or constructed by, the traditional approach. I have categorized these themes as *"positioning against"* and *rhetorical style.* The

latter asserts itself in patterns of talk which differ, at the interpersonal or exchange level of communication[216], from what the listener hears as "standard" or "neutral". This theme is apparent to me, as listener[217], in the speech patterns of speakers from whom I differ on dimensions such as age, race, culture, and sexual orientation. Interestingly enough, this theme[218] remains nearly invisible to me when the only dimension on which I differ from the speaker is that of gender.

The second theme, that of "positioning against", is prevalent, at the textual or message level of communication, in the comments of a majority of the festival directors. This theme reveals itself in the speaker's comments when the speaker describes her or himself through contrast with a prevailing trend, image, belief or idea, the existence and identifying character of which are assumed as part of a shared understanding. By structuring their comments in relation to a shared understanding, the speakers are making explicit reference to either the context of the situation or of the narrative in which they are engaged, or to the context of the discourse, in which the ideas with which they are concerned are embedded.

"Positioning against" and *rhetorical style*, then, differ markedly from the themes in the first phase of the analysis. These latter themes - "Stakeholders", "Vision", "Stages" -

---

216 The various "levels of communication", more properly referred to as metafunctions of the clause, will be described in excruciating detail later in the chapter.

217 And as a single, white, middle class, female, academic wannabe, lapsed New Yorker/American exile in my very late thirties.

218 This theme can be thought of, in terms of functional grammar, as the degree to which modality becomes salient in the talk of the other: if one considers an evangelical style of preaching as a stereotypical instance of a rhetorical style which seems "other" to the average North American, the use of question/ response as rhetorical tools becomes evident: "Do you hear me sister?" "Amen!" Whereas the 'whitebread' version of the same rhetorical flourish, "know what I mean?" "yeah" appears to most of us as neutral and uninflected to the point that one is not fully conscious of hearing it. Thus, in the first example the mode of talk (question, response) appears salient, in the second the mode is understood at a taken-for-granted level.

conform, though only partially and superficially[219], to the ideational or representational level of communication; they are concerned with what the speaker is ostensibly talking about. The themes resulting in this second phase of the analysis move beyond the superficial accounting of what the speaker's comments are *about*. The themes emphasized here are concerned with, as well, what the speaker is *doing* in or with their talk: what is the speaker acting to accomplish on the interpersonal level? The present themes also explore the speaker's comments as they are constructed textually: where does the speaker locate her- or himself in the *context* of the situation and of the surrounding discourse? Where the first themes are static, objectified and general, these second themes are dynamic, they are not divorced, artificially, from the personal, and they are thoroughly located in their social context.

The next section of this chapter defines "discourse" and "discourse analysis" and then discusses the satisfaction of the various criteria mentioned above. Also described are the level and unit of analysis employed and the theoretical bases for the transcription, presentation and functional analysis of data.

A Discourse Analysis of Interview Data

That the method employed in this chapter has been constructed or compiled, rather than dusted off and followed[220] has been driven both by preference and by necessity. In terms of preference, it seems obvious from the previous analysis that not even the most thoroughly theoretically grounded of the orthodox approaches to qualitative data provide explicit mechanisms to address difference. In the previous analysis, in spite of the study having been designed to access the voices of people who do not look entirely like mainstream leaders, differences are

---

[219] It will be seen below, in the discussion of functional grammar, that the traditional, non-critical, conception of talk as simple representation largely ignores distinctions between, for example, the Actor and the acted-upon, or between participant, process, and circumstance.

[220] The privileging of methodology over context, philosophy, or goals, in the belief that close adherence to a "proven" method (i.e. *methodolatry*) will assure the invulnerability of one's results, is a constant temptation, and one which I continue to struggle to overcome.

either suppressed or devalued: contrary to my impression as interviewer that the directors I spoke to displayed strong and obvious differences, the results of the analysis of the transcripts of their interviews blurred their distinctiveness, and made all of their comments seem mere variations on some very similar themes.

This reduction of difference happens for at least two reasons. First, the aggregating techniques of orthodox methods of coding and categorizing qualitative data are based on the recognition of categories and concepts by the researcher; nothing in the methodology assists or propels the researcher to recognize concepts outside of her or his own prior experience. This point has been made in the first two chapters in regard to the neglect of the experience of women and minority men in literatures historically and continuously dominated by white men; it is supported by a wealth of studies, from primatology to molecular biology[221], all of which demonstrate the eternal tendency of the researcher to see what s/he knows rather than to know what s/he sees.

Second, difference is suppressed in the previous analysis in the superficial and non-critical conception of language which is inherent to traditional approaches to qualitative data. Even the most commonsense notion of text does *not* encourage us to accept the written or the spoken word at face value: how much credence does the person on the street give to talk reported at third-hand, or to the average newspaper report? The former is called gossip and the latter occasions the precept "not to believe everything you read." If CNN can manipulate reality, whether purposely or unwittingly, through fragmenting videotaped segments and presenting them in particular contexts with particular frames, why then should bits of transcribed interviews, framed and contextualized with equal care, be any more convincing, any less subject to distortion? What is needed is a methodology which takes a critical approach to both the presentation of reality in language and the presentation of language as reality. What is needed is a theoretical lens which assists in the recognition of categories other than those imposed by the researcher.

Discourse analysis is an explicitly critical method and one which offers, at least in its more linguistically-

---

[221] On primatology, science and social science, see Haraway (1989); on Nobel prize winner Barbara McClintock's work in molecular biology, see Keller (1983, 1985).

oriented versions, theories of wording as mechanisms for analysis. But in terms of "doing" discourse analysis, necessity thus far demands an individualized approach[222]. There are, despite a multiplicity of disciplinary origins[223], strong correspondences between definitions of "discourse"; in definitions of "discourse analysis" one can usually discern at least a family resemblance, seeing different approaches as means to a similar end. The *methods* employed under the rubric of discourse analysis, however, often bear little relation each to another: no one specific method dominates and few have been thoroughly theoretically elaborated. The following series of definitions locates the theoretical derivation of the methodology used here.

I follow Kress in considering as central to the definition of discourse the commonplace notion of a "mode of talking". Kress points to the existence of a common understanding of a "medical discourse", a "legal discourse" or a "racist discourse"; I would add that these are most often conceptualized negatively, carrying connotations of either being laden with jargon or functioning as propaganda, or both, as would be understood by many in reference to a "feminist discourse" or a "discourse of multiculturalism". Kress's description links these modes of talking with social institutions:

---

[222] The legendary description of "swing" would seem to describe equally well "how to do" discourse analysis, or deconstruction for that matter: if you have to ask, you haven't got it.

[223] Some of the theoretical frameworks within which discourse theories have been developed are listed by Bruce (1992) as: hermeneutics; post-structuralism; critical theory; linguistic philosophy; ethnomethodology; tacit knowledge theory and critical rationalism.

> ...social institutions produce specific ways or modes of talking about certain areas of social life, which are related to the place and nature of that institution. That is, in relation to certain areas of social life that are of particular significance to a social institution, it will produce a set of statements about that area that will define, describe, delimit, and circumscribe what it is possible and impossible to say with respect to it, and how it is to be talked about. So, for instance, matters such as gender, authority, race, professionalism, science, or the family will have specific discourses associated with them... [224]

Similar to Kress's definition is a literary approach outlined by Bruce; though this latter description is a bit ponderous in its wording, it introduces several elements by which a discourse might be understood. In Bruce's view, discourse emerges through texts and operates through rules:

> [discourse is] a dispersion of texts whose historical mode of inscription allows us to describe them as a space of enunciative regularities
> [discourse is] a set of anonymous, historically situated rules (generic systems, repertoires of topoï, principles of narrative syntax which determine the manner in which énoncés are linked, and many others) which are determined by the time and space which define a given époque; and which determine for a given social, economic, geographical or linguistic field the conditions of enunciation: in other words, the principles which determine what is *sayable* and which assure the discursive division of labour. [225]

This latter description is useful for outlining the parameters of what I mean by the mainstream discourse of leadership. The leadership discourse, from this perspective, can be found in the body of texts which we see as historically linked and as more or less coherent in their

---

[224] Kress (1985:28)

[225] Bruce (1992: 4-5), emphasis in original. This is congruent with the work of Foucault, who provides the most explicit theoretical discussion of this general approach to discourse; Kress points to, as the best examples of this discussion, Foucault (1970; 1971) and "Prison Talk" (1980b:37-54).

"enunciation" of the concept of leadership. It would strike most people as not surprising, for example, that Bass, in the latest edition of *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, routinely makes reference to studies from the 1920's. Or if one does wonder at the relevance of such work to the leadership corpus of our time, one will be reassured by such titles as "Cooperation and competition: An experimental study in motivation"[226]: although certain aspects of the studies may be dated, the language is that of familiar leadership territory. Which is to say that the texts through which the discourse of leadership emerges are historically inscribed and recognizable through regularities of language and expression.

In the same way, it is not controversial that Bass quotes from both *The Iliad* and from Machiavelli's *The Prince*, nor that he notes the derogatory connotation that adheres now to aspects of both works. He comments, for example, in regard to Odysseus that "Shrewdness and cunning are not regarded as highly in contemporary society as they once were." Nor can the (putative) waning of admiration for "shrewdness and cunning" among our leaders be attributed to any specific writer: the "rule" barring "shrewdness and cunning" is "anonymous" and "historically situated." That certain men today in Bosnia or Rwanda or Somalia, carrying rifles and engaged in ethnic warfare, are considered in their respective geographic and cultural spheres as leaders is not disputed; that North Americans consider - nonproblematically - these same men as leaders is less clear: spatial, social, geographic and economic boundaries limit the applicability of the respective leadership discourses.

That these discourses are linked with, to hearken back to Kress's description, specific social institutions can be clearly seen if one contrasts the North American with socially and geographically "other" discourses: in North America, specific institutions productive of the mainstream leadership discourse would be the government, the academy and the corporation. In Rwanda, in concert with the institution of the government is the institution of the tribe; in Bosnia, the government agrees or conflicts with institutionalized religion. Thus, Bruce's definition may be re-written to describe the discourse of leadership as follows:

---

[226] Maller (1925)

> A set of anonymous, historically situated rules, themes, topics and principles of leadership which are determined by the time and space defining a given epoch; and which determine for a given social, economic, geographical or linguistic field what is sayable about leadership and which assures the division of leaders from non-leaders, or leadership practices from practices which do not constitute leadership.

Bruce's version of discourse analysis is applied to the study of literary texts and focuses to a great extent on the "ideologème", a signifying unit or figure of speech. He writes, for example, of the changing connotation given the term "the struggle" in France before and during the revolution[227]. This version of analysis takes place at a mid-range level, between the macro-processes of ideology and meta-narrative and the micro-processes of the clause and the sentence. But like most analyses at this mid-range level, the specific methodology here is not elucidated. Although ostensibly devoted to understanding the production and contestation of social meanings at the level of everyday practices, the majority of mid-range discourse analyses remain idiosyncratic in their application and thus are open to the charge that they are more accurately termed interpretation than analysis[228].

The more micro-level versions of discourse analysis tend to be based on linguistics; these in general provide a more explicitly theorized methodology, grounded in grammatical or narrative structures. In addition, linguistics-based analyses focus less exclusively on works of literature; the majority of analyses are of spoken language and of texts of everyday life: newspaper accounts, print ads, court records. Discourse analysis at this level is oriented to what Foucault referred to as the micro practices or capillary processes of power as power pervades the everyday. An express connection between discourse and specific language features is made by Kress:

---

[227] Bruce notes, for example, that initially in the work of Vallès (1832-1885), the phrase "the struggle" ("la lutte") connotes a Darwinian struggle, for example a young man's struggle to make his way in the world. Later in the work of Vallès, "the struggle" is used solely to refer to "the class struggle."

[228] This "charge" is explained below in the discussion of Halliday's work on functional grammar.

> Discourse, in this sense, is not neutral with respect to language; certain syntactic forms will necessarily correlate with certain discourses... For instance, in discourses of power and authority, social agency will be assigned in particular ways, and this will be expressed through particular transitivity forms; or specific modal forms will systematically express relations of power. In this way a given discourse, say sexist discourse, will display certain quite characteristic linguistic features, expressive of causality or agency, power, gender, as well as linguistic features serving to focalize or topicalize specific aspects of the discourse. [229]

It is this attention to features of language and their association with discrete, contradictory, or complementary discourses which enables the researcher to begin to analyze, rather than to impose or intuit meaning. The functional grammar[230] elucidated by Halliday is the most thorough-going theory of wordings and forms the basis for this second part of the analysis. Halliday makes a strong argument for the use of a grammar, or a theory of wordings:

> A discourse analysis that is not based on grammar is not an analysis at all, but simply a running commentary on a text: either an appeal has to be made to some set of non-linguistic conventions, or to some linguistic features that are trivial enough to be accessible without a grammar, like the number of words per sentence (and even the objectivity of these is often illusory); or else the exercise remains a private one in which one explanation is as good or as bad as another.[231]

The use of Halliday's grammar in discourse analysis does not, of course, necessitate the acceptance of quite such a strong stand on the 'one best way' to approach analysis. But his emphasis on grammar as an "attempt to crack the [semantic] code" provides the basis for a theorized methodology for discourse analysis which is lacking in other approaches.

---

[229] Kress (1985:28)

[230] The distinction between a functional and a traditional grammar is elucidated later in the chapter.

[231] Halliday (1985: xvii)

> Each language has its own semantic code, although languages that share a common culture tend to have codes that are closely related. Whorf[232] referred to "Standard Average European" as the common code shared by the main European languages, which he showed to be very different from that of at least one American Indian language...
>
> Just as each text has its environment, the "context of situation" in Malinowski's[233] terms, so the language system has its environment, Malinowski's "context of culture". The context of culture determines the nature of the code. As a language is manifested through its texts, a culture is manifested through its situations; so by attending to text-in-situation a child construes the code, and by using the code to interpret text he construes the culture. Thus for the individual, the code engenders the culture; and this gives a powerful inertia to the transmission process. [234]

The last several lines of Halliday's description are illustrated best for me by a recent example in my own life of the North American "code" for "Black". A Black woman that I have known since childhood recently mentioned to me that when she left the small town where we both grew up, many people assumed she was white. I was startled to hear this; but when I gave her appearance some thought, I realized that her skin was very pale, her lips and nose were narrow, and her hair was a little less curly than my mother's. How had I, as a child, identified her as Black?

Through "attending to text-in-situation": notwithstanding her appearance, my friend was described to me as Black by my family and classmates. Thus, as a child, I construed "the code": "Black" means "not-white", if not by virtue of appearance, then by family name or home address. By "using the code to interpret text" I construed the culture: Pat was related to other Turners who were Black; she lived in a neighborhood where only Blacks lived;

---

[232] Benjamin Whorf, American linguist and anthropologist in the first half of this century, wrote of the connection between language, culture and cognition. See Whorf, 1959.
[233] Bronislaw Malinowski was a British functionalist anthropologist best known for his work among the Trobriand Islanders in the early part of this century.
[234] Halliday (1985: xxxii)

thus Blacks are people who are related to each other but not to us, and they live in Black neighborhoods outside "our" town. The "code engenders the culture": Blacks are not whites, they don't marry, sleep with, or live with whites. That this "gives a powerful inertia to the transmission process" is obvious to me from the fact that when I look at her photograph, I look at her pale skin and narrow nose and smooth hair and see a Black woman.

No less powerful is the inertia this conflation of language/ culture gives to the analytical process. The research situation is mediated by the cultural context. The researcher is immersed in a culture which profoundly affects her or his interpretation of both the situation and the text. In the present research, although some subjects come from different cultures of origin and some abide within subcultures that are theorized to differ significantly from the dominant culture, all were speaking the same language as the researcher. Difference itself is delimited by the language's semantic code: "Black" is "not white". Can the speaker make use of the language to produce other than the categories of experience as mandated by the dominant culture - or must one agree with Beckett that the "vociferations" of the dominant group make difference impossible to voice?[235] As I attend to "text-in-situation", can I disengage from the code and the culture within which my own social and personal identity was formed? For if I cannot, won't all of the texts that I read appear to me in the categories familiar from and delimited by my experience? Again, traditional methods of analysis do not offer any mechanism by which to escape the conundrum of one language, many realities.

Theories of functional grammar, however, offer a perspective on language which does not evaluate meaning as a function of the degree to which language in use approaches language in an ideal form; such theories support the analysis of meaning as it is actively realized. The grammar that most of us studied in school was, in contrast to *functional* grammar, a grammar of *syntax*. The focus in high school English classes of twenty years ago was on invariant

---

[235] The connection between language and the dominant cultural group is also made by Goodenough (1978; also discussed in Chapter 1), who pays particular attention to the control of access to the media and to positions of authority in higher education. The language/culture/power nexus has recently captured popular attention in the U.S. in discussions of the so-called "intellectual elite".

forms - parts of speech - to which meaning was seen as attached; language was considered a system of forms which carried meaning. Functional grammar focuses not on discrete and invariant forms, but on how meaning is accomplished; language is seen "as a system of meanings, accompanied by forms through which the meanings can be realized"[236].

Criteria

Thus it is through the use of functional grammar that this second portion of the analysis attains the strongest measure of INTERNAL VALIDITY. The relevance of themes centered upon in the analysis is demonstrated through attention to the functionality of grammatical forms in the creation of meaning in the data. That such functionality can be easily overlooked but that attention to it provides a critical impetus to language studies can be demonstrated by reference to the work of linguists in re-evaluating what was once called "Nonstandard Negro English." William Labov, for example, was one of the first to analyze what he and his colleagues came to call "black English vernacular"; he described this language dialect, used predominantly by Black youth in urban centers throughout the U.S., as a relatively uniform grammatical system, one which discarded or re configured invariant forms of "standard" English[237] in the creation of an alternative language. A major conclusion of his work was that this dialect existed not as a deficient form of "standard" English, but as a form of resistance, and as a symbol of social and political conflict[238]. This conclusion, again, is made possible by reference not to form, but to function.

The relevance of analytical concepts which guarantees internal validity in the language-based approach is less dependent on decontextualization than is that of the orthodox approach; primacy is given not to the abstract conceptualizations of the researcher but to the *texture* of

---

[236] Halliday (1985:xiv)

[237] The word "standard" is written in quotations to underline that the existence of a standard form of any language is contested; what Americans from the northeastern states might think of as the "standard" English would no doubt be hotly contested by Americans from the south and the west, by Canadians and by natives of the British Isles, none of whom would be expected to agree with the others.

[238] Labov (1972:xiii-xiv)

elements centered on by the analysis, first within and second across data sets. The concept of texture, from the viewpoint of functional grammar, is a product of various discourse processes of a text and includes the workings of both structural and cohesive elements[239]. Attention to texture is in fact a critical component of validity; it is constructed at a level above that of the clause or sentence and is thus a dimension of language which not only reflects the semantic code, but which may be employed so that it is inconsistent with, contradicts, counters, or plays against the prevailing code. Decontextualizing excerpts from interview data can bring into focus elements of the code which are taken for granted when embedded in text; analyzing textual elements of interview data facilitates a focus on those aspects of the text which contest the code, but which are masked by their encoding in standard forms[240].

Because a discourse analytic approach takes a critical stance vis-à-vis language, the measure of EXTERNAL VALIDITY must be made against more critical sources than the mainstream literature of leadership referred to in the first phase of the analysis. In this portion of the analysis, an attempt is being made to address the applicability of the research method to the experience and the accounts of women and men not focused upon in the mainstream literature; thus a crucial measure of external validity is conceptualized in feminist literature as that of *voice*. The criteria for gender and racial inclusivity, addressed below, serve effectively as criteria for measuring external validity in terms of voice. The emphasis here is the valuation and the analysis of the nuances of individual voices; the assimilation to a standard which is embedded in the aggregating processes typical of traditional approaches to

---

[239] Structural elements include thematic and information structures; cohesive elements include reference, ellipsis and substitution, conjunction and lexical cohesion (Halliday, 1985:313). Structural features are given greater emphasis than cohesive elements in the section below which treats functional grammar as a methodological base; this is so because many cohesive elements will be familiar to the reader from traditional analyses of language.

[240] While the emphasis on texture does facilitate a focus on critical elements of a text, it is not *solely* useful for this purpose; my point is that without this sort of reading it is difficult to uncover aspects of text critical of the dominant cultural/semiotic code.

qualitative analysis is replaced here with the investigation of the texture of specific accounts. Rather than rely on decontextualization, in the accounts used for this portion of the analysis, a measure of the integrity of the account is preserved.

RELIABILITY AND OBJECTIVITY can again be most convincingly addressed through reliance on excerpts from the texts used, the transcribed interviews. As stressed in the last chapter, it is through the use of excerpts that the reader has access to material from which themes have been drawn and has the opportunity to evaluate for her or himself the relevance of the themes to the data. Unlike the material in the last chapter, however, the interview excerpts here are presented in a format which preserves to a much greater degree an integrity of context; this increases the reader's ability to form her or his own conclusions.

Both the emphasis on texture and the presentation of data in more complete form aid in privileging the experience of the speaker and the text produced by the speaker, rather than the interpretation of the researcher. It is theorized that these elements of the method will be more appropriate for the analysis of accounts presented by those whose perspective is not necessarily reflected in the dominant culture. While the facts of the research situation cannot be redressed *post hoc*, I believe that the method can be articulated to the specifics of the text of each informant's account; the presentation of portions of each speaker's account which preserve some degree of integrity can then also likely render the METHOD APPROPRIATE TO THE REALITY OF WOMEN AND MINORITY MEN. In this way the fifth question[241] of the original critique might be satisfied.

In the same way, the attempt to focus the analysis on the meaning constructed by the speaker, rather than by the researcher, is offered as a means of addressing the sixth question of the critique. An emphasis on the CONCRETE EXPERIENCE OF THE SUBJECT is achieved in the close attention given to the processes of meaning employed by the speaker in

---

[241] As was stated at the end of Chapter 4, the first four questions of the critique assembled in the second chapter were largely satisfied by the design of the present research, in that woman and men traditionally ignored by the mainstream literature were included as subjects, were given an opportunity to focus specifically on their own concerns, and were not assumed to be well-described by the theoretical base of traditional studies of leadership.

her or his spoken account. Language, from the perspective of a discourse analytic approach, is seen as constitutive of reality; thus close attention to the structure of a speaker's account goes beyond recognizing the place of experience in the text, to acknowledging the place of the text in experience. Halliday refers to this when he says, "a text is not a mere reflection of what lies beyond; it is an active partner in the reality-making and reality-changing processes"[242].

The acknowledgment of language as constitutive of reality has implications as well for THE PLACE OF DIALOGUE IN THE ANALYSIS, which is the issue raised by the seventh question. The naïve academic convention in which data, especially interview data, is presented as if unaffected by the presence of the researcher is not possible in this approach. That the interview data analyzed here was gathered as the result of a dialogue, no matter how limited, with the researcher must be acknowledged directly. In addition, the use of relatively "complete" segments of the accounts given by speakers leaves open a space for dialogue with the reader which in traditional research is substituted with the presentation of forgone conclusions, often in a conscious move to preempt dialogue with competing interpretive models.

The several elements of AN ETHIC OF CARE (the eighth question) can be addressed in this approach to the data. The role of individual expressiveness receives unaccustomed attention in Halliday's version of functional grammar: rhythm, intonation, and repetition are some of the aspects of expressiveness which can be subject to analysis when an emphasis on functionality and texture balances that on form and decontextualization in more orthodox approaches. Empathy for the speaker, and for her or his world view, is most clearly provided for in terms of the exposure of the reader to more complete, in contrast with more fragmented, utterances.

Finally, the measure of THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE RESEARCHER (the ninth question) in this work is made explicit as well in the use of, in virtually every case, the complete utterance as the primary vehicle of meaning. In the presentation of the analysis here, the voice of the researcher is posed in obvious contrast to the voice of the subject; my voice is not disguised or made neutral, but is etched in relief, counterposed, against that of the speaker.

---

[242] Halliday (1985:318)

And that which I speak about, describe, or analyze is presented as a sense-making whole. Because that which I presume to dissect is presented in a context, my accountability to the subject is less easily avoided.

Specifics of the method

In this section, several details of the method are illustrated or described: the level and unit of analysis employed in the methodology; the view of transcription embedded in the methodology; the shift in focus from traditional to functional grammar which underlies the methodology; and, finally, an example is provided of the analysis of a short text into the various metafunctions which the grammar emphasizes.

Level and unit of analysis

The spoken texts of the interviewees in this phase of the analysis are analyzed at the level of what Bakhtin referred to as the utterance. The utterance is defined by Bakhtin as the natural unit of speech, the only "*real unit* of speech communication"; it is the unit of speech bounded by "a *change of speaking subjects*, that is a change of speakers"[243]. In this change of speakers the utterance has an absolute beginning and an absolute end. The utterance signifies an entire statement of position on the part of the speaker; if it is not all a speaker *can* say, it is all the speaker *wishes* to say at the moment. The utterance is seen as always oriented toward the "active responsive understanding"[244] of the other or others[245], to whom the speaker addresses her or his words, against which she or he argues, with which he or she wishes to concur. Finally, the form of the utterance is explicitly dependent upon and

---

[243] Bakhtin (1986:71), emphasis in original. Bakhtin makes the argument that the utterance describes written communication of every kind as well as it describes individual rejoinders in a dialogue; a novel or a scientific paper also has a clear beginning and end, and is also constructed as a complete statement responding to, and oriented toward the understanding of, another.

[244] Bakhtin (1986:75)

[245] The emphasis on the role of the other in speech communication, that is, the essential significance of the communicative function of language (as opposed to language as individual expression) constitutes one of the central assertions in Bakhtin's classic essay, "The problem of speech genres" - the essay quoted here.

reflective of social context. The utterance is seen to be composed of stable and generic forms[246], as the following examples from Bakhtin make clear:

> We speak only in definite speech genres, that is, all our utterances have definite and relatively stable typical *forms of construction of the whole*. Our repertoire of oral (and written) speech genres is rich. We use them confidently and skillfully *in practice*, and it is quite possible for us not even to suspect their existence *in theory*. Like Molière's Monsieur Jourdain who, when speaking in prose, had no idea that was what he was doing, we speak in diverse genres without suspecting that they exist. Even in the most free, the most unconstrained conversation, we cast our speech in definite generic forms, sometimes rigid and trite ones, sometimes more flexible, plastic, and creative ones... [247]

> Such, for example, are the various everyday genres of greetings, farewells, congratulations, all kinds of wishes, information about health, business, and so forth. These genres are so diverse because they differ depending on the situation, social position, and personal interrelations of the participants in the communication. These genres have high, strictly official, respectful forms as well as familiar ones. [248]

---

[246] The notion of the utterance as "purely social and mandatory" (Bakhtin, 1986:81) distinguishes the work of Bakhtin from that of earlier linguists, who in the main followed Saussure in considering the utterance ("la parole") a willful, individual, and intellectual act.

[247] Bakhtin (1986:78), emphasis in original

[248] Bakhtin (1986:79)

> Many people who have an excellent command of a language often feel quite helpless in certain spheres of communication precisely because they do not have a practical command of the generic forms used in the given spheres. Frequently a person who has an excellent command of speech in some areas of cultural communication, who is able to read a scholarly paper or engage in a scholarly discussion, who speaks very well on social questions, is silent or very awkward in social conversation. Here it is not a matter of an impoverished vocabulary or style, taken abstractly: this is entirely a matter of the inability to command a repertoire of genres of social conversation, the lack of a sufficient supply of those ideas about the whole of the utterance that help to cast one's speech quickly and naturally in certain compositional and stylistic forms, the inability to grasp a word promptly, to begin and end correctly... [249]

Making use of the utterance as the level of analysis brings to bear several changes of emphasis in comparison with the use of decontextualized sentences, or series of sentences, characteristic of orthodox approaches to qualitative data. First, the demarcation of a meaningful statement of position is determined by the speaker and not by the researcher. Second, the construction of an account as constituting a meaningful whole becomes explicitly a subject for analysis: what does the speaker posit as a complete response? Last, the implication of both the questioner and the broader social context in the individual response is also made explicit; the utterance presupposes the existence of not only the immediate other of "real-life dialogue"[250], but of a community of others in the context of which one is speaking. Thus, the impact of the questioner on the words of the speakers comes of necessity under scrutiny, as does the existence of repertoires of normative and relatively stable forms which reflect the contexts of the various communities within which the speaker locates her or himself.

While the level of analysis is the utterance, the unit of analysis here is the clause. The clause is in fact a much less contentious unit of speech than is the sentence; the historical difficulty in establishing consensus around the definition of the sentence is reflected in Bakhtin's

---

[249] Bakhtin (1986:80)
[250] Bakhtin (1986:75)

view of the sentence as an incomplete aspect of the utterance[251], and in Halliday's functional view of the sentence as an expanded version of the clause, the "clause complex"[252]. Both Bakhtin's concern for completion and Halliday's concern for function can be addressed by making the clause the unit of analysis within the boundaries of the utterance. Within the utterance, as the minimum meaningful unit of speech communication, the clause is the minimum complete component of grammatical structure.

The clause as unit of analysis is operationalized as the basic text unit in transcription: each line of transcript, in general, is equivalent to a clause. This mechanical division of the text into clauses is of inestimable importance in the analysis of structure, making visible distinct meaning processes which we as listeners and readers normally "hear". At times in the transcriptions, the text unit is further broken down into constituent parts making up the clause (prepositional groups, for example); this is done to facilitate the analysis of longer clauses and to account for the variation in vocal phrasing and intonation which provides additional meaning in spoken language.

Transcription and presentation

Reflected in the foregoing is the notion, explicitly embedded in this second phase of the analysis, that transcription cannot be separated from analysis. That conventions surrounding the transcription of tape-recorded data form an integral aspect of the analysis is reflected in the attention to - and in the controversy surrounding and in the diversity of approaches to - transcription in conversation analysis, where the timing of pauses and hesitations is sometimes recorded in tenths of a second. In orthodox social science approaches to interview data, however, the topic is almost universally neglected; in Denzin and Lincoln's very large *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, the references to transcriptions acknowledge that they are time-consuming, costly and lengthy, but are otherwise uniformly non-problematic - with the exception of one sentence in which the editors mention that there is a danger in turning over the transcribing task to someone who lacks "intimate familiarity with the field setting and the processes being studied"[253]. It seems to me the rule, rather than the exception, that the person doing the transcribing

---

251 Bakhtin (1986:73-75)

252 Halliday (1985:192-193)

253 Denzin & Lincoln (1994:358)

would be intimately familiar with neither the field setting nor the processes being studied. In the *Handbook*, another writer makes reference to "the detailed transcriptions produced of the speech, pauses, overlaps and intonations of everyday conversations", but nowhere is there any indication of how, whether, or to what degree pauses, overlaps and intonations should be transcribed. If published "representative excerpts" are any indication, these are generally *not* transcribed. Conversely, if the presentation of published excerpts *does not* reflect the level of detail represented in the actual transcript, why are such discrepancies not made the subject of some convention or at least alluded to on a case-by-case basis?

Anecdotal evidence from such sources on qualitative analysis in the social sciences as Denzin and Lincoln's *Handbook*, the works of Strauss and colleagues, published accounts of qualitative analysis in organizational journals, texts which cover the range from traditional methodology to personal and critical approaches to method[254], graduate coursework in qualitative methods, and discussions with colleagues in several far-flung universities, leads me to believe that the vast majority of transcriptions of interview data are produced by hired secretarial help with no knowledge of either field or processes, make use of idiosyncratic and highly inconsistent representations (invented by the typist, perhaps in collaboration with the researcher) of such things as "pauses, overlaps and intonations", and are at most spot-checked, after they are produced, against the tape of the original conversation. The first example below is a classic example of the effect punctuation has on meaning; the second is an example of this type of error, found more than once in the transcriptions I "hired out".

> Woman without man is nothing.
> Woman. Without, man is nothing.
>
> No, I wouldn't say that leaders carry messages.
> No, I wouldn't say that. Leaders carry messages.

I agree with Reissman when she maintains that "analysis cannot be easily distinguished from transcription"[255]. In

---

[254] I am thinking of the range from Baker (1988) to Reinharz (1984).

[255] Reissman (1993:60)

fact, I submit that transcription *is* analysis. If not explicitly guided by theory, transcription, as in the characterization above, is governed by the implicit, and naïve, theory that language is transparent and that the representation of spoken interaction in print is non-problematic. Reissman refers to an analogy between the transcription of the spoken word and the photographic representation of images:

> by displaying text in particular ways, we provide grounds for our arguments, just like a photographer guides the viewer's eye with lenses and by cropping images. Different transcription conventions lead to and support different interpretations and ideological positions, and they ultimately create different worlds. Meaning is constituted in very different ways with alternative transcriptions of the same stretch of talk.[256]

Following Mishler, Reissman describes transcription as "rhetorical"[257]: the manipulations of data which are rendered invisible by a naïve approach to transcription can serve as powerful persuasive tools. In the following example from my data, the version I would choose might depend on whether I believed the interviewee was being dishonest, or I believed s/he was making a brilliant point, or if I wanted to show that certain speakers were more hesitant than others, or if I stuttered myself and didn't think it should interfere with the message, or if I trusted to a transcriber who didn't type in disfluencies - in which case the rhetorical effect of the transcription would happen at the discretion of the typist.

1. Um, there's very little, um, I wo-, I would imagine, I don't know, I could be proved wrong, but, I imagine that, I, you know, I, I, I, I don't think that I do very much of that, that, you know, where it's very sort of um, uh, sort of, personally, I don't, I don't think I talk in a very personally-directed way.

---

[256] Reissman (1993:13) Reissman credits the analogy to photography to Mishler (1991).

[257] Reissman (1993:13) refers here to Mishler's 1991 article, the title of which neatly encapsulates the argument I am making: "Representing discourse: The rhetoric of transcription".

2. I don't think I talk in a very personally-directed way.

My point here is not that every transcription must capture the most detailed representation of speech possible, or that only fully transcribed portions of texts must be used in excerpts for presentation. In brief, I agree with Reissman's suggestions on these points:

> My general advice is to begin with a rough transcription, a first draft of the entire interview that gets the words and other striking features of the conversation on paper (e.g., crying, laughing, very long pauses). Then go back and retranscribe selected portions for detailed analysis.[258]

Of course, Reissman's idea of a "rough transcription" corresponds to what many would think of as quite detailed; she includes an account from her own experience in which she found that a transcriber had left out asides, "talk that wasn't in answer to the question"[259]. In this section, she makes it clear that a rough transcription must still include every utterance on the tape. And, as to the matter of retranscription of those segments of the tape deemed interesting or important, she makes her strongest statement, one to which my experience corresponds:

> I know of no way to avoid the painstaking work of personally retranscribing the sections of text that appear [interesting]... In my experience, the task of identifying [important] segments and their representation cannot be delegated. It is not a technical operation but the stuff of analysis itself, the "unpacking" of structure that is essential to interpretation. By transcribing at this level, interpretive categories emerge, ambiguities in language are heard on the tape, and the oral record - the way the story is told - provides clues about meaning. Insights from these various sources shape the difficult decision about how to represent oral discourse as a written text.[260]

The decision to present transcribed material occasions a different issue. While fully transcribed speech is critical

---

258 Reissman (1993:56)
259 Reissman (1993:57)
260 Reissman (1993: 58)

for close analysis, it can be very difficult to read and can work to obscure the point the researcher wishes to make. Reissman, for example, is interested in narrative and poetic structures; disfluencies, pauses, and introjections by the interviewer ("um-hm", "really?") blur the elements of structure that she wishes to emphasize. In the presentation of her own work and the work of others in her 1993 text, she displays fully transcribed excerpts and reductions of excerpts, to core structures, side-by-side in a column format. But even without the presentation of the full transcription, the description of a version which omits repetition, hesitations and disfluencies as "a reduction" makes explicit the mediation of the researcher in the representation of speech. The distinction between representations which are falsely presented as non-problematic and an explicitly theorized reduction of material which has been analyzed in the most detailed form possible, is the operative distinction between the treatment of data in the first, orthodox phase and the second, critical phase of the present analysis.

For this analysis I fully transcribed all of the interviews; the excerpts presented in the first part of the analysis, like the excerpts which will follow, are reductions from full transcriptions in that they exclude disfluencies, word repetitions, and short pauses. "Backchannelling" on my part - the sort of introjection mentioned above, which is intended to signal understanding and empathy on the part of the listener but which is not intended as a bid to "take the floor", and does not qualify as a change of speakers - is also excluded. False starts are for the most part excluded, unless the discarded start consists of a full clause or more. For the sake of making clear to what point a transcription has been idealized, I would refer to a reduction of fully transcribed speech by "cleaning up" only disfluencies, short pauses and backchannelling as a First-level reduction. Reduction to core narrative structures or to elements of poetic structure, as made use of by Reissman and others, could be seen as Second-level reductions. Presentation of the transcript in a format which breaks lines by clauses is used in the phase of the analysis which follows, for the reasons stated above.

Functional grammar as a methodological base

As was noted earlier, the focus of a functional grammar differs from that of the grammar to which most adults have been exposed. The focus of traditional grammar is on idealized language: the furor, for example, in the 60's and

70's over the appropriateness of the language instruction archetype "See Jane run. Run, Jane, run" was, in part, an argument over the usefulness of ideal language models for real children[261]. But in the end grammar instruction was, as it is still, seen as a mechanism for the inculcation in children of "standard English"; this facility is indeed measured in terms of proximity to an ideal model.

Thus some understanding of grammar is seen as necessary to gain competence in standard English but, beyond the basics, grammar quickly comes under the category of esoterica. Advanced grammar is something linguists theorize about, something which can only be considered relevant in that one day it might enable us to make computers talk. Language study at the post-secondary level demonstrates a tidy polarization of the uses of grammar: for business writing one needs to have - and to stick to - the basics. For linguistics and computers one might make use of an esoteric grammar, an exotic "calculus of language". Everything in between is ineffable. "Creative writing" is in fact regarded very much as is the interpretation of qualitative data: it is not something which can be taught, but only practiced[262].

But functional grammar is focused on neither the invariant classes, proper constructions and preferred sequences with which traditional grammar is concerned, nor is its usefulness restricted to the attempt to uncover a "deep structure" of linguistic predisposition[263]. In functional grammar the focus is turned away from the *pieces* of which language (or in the esoteric case, Ur-language) is composed and toward the *function* which language is being manipulated to accomplish.

This emphasis on function is invaluable in qualitative analysis for several reasons. First, functional grammar is capable of a focus on real as opposed to ideal language.

---

[261] The furor was also largely concerned with the effectiveness of a phonetic approach to the acquisition of reading skills, a debate I need not, (thankfully), go into here.

[262] The most frequent response I've heard to Van Maanen's argument that we make explicit, and more fully exploit, the art and craft of research writing has been "That's fine for Van Maanen - he can really *write*."

[263] Though from what I've read, when it comes to esoterica functional grammarians do manage to hold their own with the "calculus of language" crowd.

For the analysis of spoken language, a traditional grammar is almost useless: conversation analysts show that, in an average, mundane dialogue, between ellipses, feints, and allusions, it is a miracle that we understand each other at all, much less be able to diagram neatly what we are doing. The language of daily use, from lectures and song lyrics to television commercials and newspaper headlines, is complex, flexible, and little resembles the subject-verb-object, full-sentence ideal of our primary school grammar books.

The notion of the degree to which everyday language conforms (or does not) to the ideal leads to a second reason that functional grammar is useful: the degree of perfection of individual language use may vary from person to person, from text to text, and from encounter to encounter, but what does not change is that language is consistently, for each person or text and in every encounter, meant to accomplish *something*. Whether I say "In the following chapter I will...", or "Excuse m-, oh, sorry, could I just..." or just "um-hm", I am doing something: I am introducing, or requesting, or accepting. Specific attention to function addresses less what language is than what language is used for: to create and explore meaning and to influence an other.

A third reason for the usefulness of functional grammar is that it is expressly suited to the critical appraisal of qualitative data. A theory of wording which attends to function exactly suits the purpose of seeing beyond one's own categories and constructing the ability to hear an other's. Instead of attending in a general way to what the other's comments are about and hearing, more often than not, what one expects to hear, one can attend more closely to the structure, and thus to the function, of the other's talk. And in doing so, one can attempt, at least, to follow the other's meaning on levels other than of simple representation.: functional grammar theorizes that talk or text constitutes not only representation, but forms an exchange and a message as well[264]. Meaning is explicitly conceptualized as multiplanar and unfolding.

It is through attention to the structure of language, and to the interplay of the three levels of language metafunction, that the workings of and resistance to dynamics of power can be traced. For the capillary mechanics of power, from the societal, to the individual level, and back, mirror exactly the dynamics of language: a

---

[264] As will be detailed immediately below.

living language is always in flux, from the level of shared language to the level of expression which is individual, but which is shared and thus has its impact on the language as a whole. And the capillary movement of power is mirrored in that movement of language. I remember, for example, the first time I had the choice, on a form, between "Ms." and "Miss"; thereafter if a form didn't list "Ms.", I would fill it in, every time, under "Other." How many forms now *don't* list "Ms."? The language changed me; I changed the language.

The remainder of this section will present a detailed example to illustrate what Halliday, in his *Introduction to Functional Grammar*[265], refers to as the metafunctions of the clause. I hope that with this example the reader will be able to approach the transcripts presented here with an enhanced capacity to assess and respond to the analysis I have done.

The following quotations are excerpted from a Canadian Organization Behaviour text. They are the first paragraphs of paired descriptions, of actual Canadian businesspersons, compiled from popular press sources; the descriptions are meant to illustrate, respectively, the leadership styles of "high initiating structure" and "high consideration."

> Kenneth Rowe is the quintessential hard-driving business leader. Rowe founded Industrial Marine Products Ltd. (now called IMP Group Ltd.) in 1967 out of the ashes of two bankrupt Nova Scotia foundries. In 1970, he developed IMP's aerospace division by buying a failing Dartmouth aircraft parts maker. Since then he has purchased and turned around more than a dozen other companies. The IMP Group now boasts 1,500 employees and revenues of over $175 million.
>
> Committed and caring. That's how people describe Joan Dawe, executive director of the St. John's Hospital Council in Newfoundland. Dawe is committed because she will see any task through to completion, and caring because she believes in the basic worth and integrity of others. She is flexible, people-oriented, and, above all, has the ability to communicate with groups.[266]

---

[265] Halliday (1985)

[266] McShane (1992:524-527, *Perspectives* 14-1, 14-2)

The interpretation of text and talk which is embedded in traditional qualitative analysis is, like our everyday understanding of shared language, untheorized. The average reader draws meaning from the above quotations through a generalized, complex, and largely less-than-conscious combination of vocabulary and sentence structure. That is, the quotations are 'about': *a man and a woman, the man is hard-driving, the woman is committed and caring, both are executives, their respective organizations are named.*

From the viewpoint of functional grammar, it is the clause which is the principal meaningful unit of communication. For the purposes of this discussion, it is sufficient to know that using the clause as the unit of analysis facilitates the division of the sentence into segments representing a single process, having only one transitivity and voice structure[267]. While meaning might appear to be derived from the clause in an amorphous, gestalt-like way, in fact it is constructed through specific, if complex and multiplanar, functions. From this perspective there are "three principal **kinds of meaning** that are embodied in the structure of a clause"[268].

> (i) the Theme is a function in the CLAUSE AS A MESSAGE. It is what the message is concerned with: the point of departure for what the speaker is going to say.
> (ii) The Subject is a function in the CLAUSE AS AN EXCHANGE. It is the element that is held responsible: in which is vested the success of the clause in whatever is its particular speech function.
> (iii) The Actor is a function in the CLAUSE AS A REPRESENTATION (of a process). It is the active participant in the process: the one that does the deed.[269]

These "kinds of meaning" constitute the functional components of the clause and all three are realized through grammar.

A 'commonsense' understanding of talk or text can be seen to rely most heavily on the last of the three "kinds of meaning," the CLAUSE AS A REPRESENTATION: without any theory of wording, one can say in a general way (as I did in the italicized remarks above) what the above quotations are 'about'. But a theorized approach to REPRESENTATION in the

---

[267] Halliday (1985:260)
[268] Halliday (1985:37), emphasis in original
[269] Halliday (1985:36-37), emphasis in original

clause throws into relief specific functions accomplished in the structure of the quotations: transitivity structures determine who is the Actor and what is the process represented.

The following figures compare the Actor/process structures for the above examples of Kenneth Rowe and Joan Dawe.

Figure 1

Kenneth Rowe	*is*	*the quintessential (etc.)*
Actor/carrier	process: being	Identifier

people	*describe*	*Joan Dawe*
Actor	process: verbal	Target

In the first clause (which is the first sentence) of the description of Kenneth Rowe, Rowe appears as the Actor, or the one "doing" the action; in this case the type of action taking place is a process of being. The process here is an identifying process: Rowe does not merely carry the attribute of leadership, but is THE quintessential hard-driving business leader.

The first full clause of the description of Joan Dawe follows a sentence fragment and an embedded clause[270]. Dawe appears as the Target of a verbal process; "people" functions as the Actor.

Figure 2

Rowe	*founded*	*Industrial Marine (etc.)*
Actor	process: material	Goal

---

[270] This fragmented and reversed structure, "Committed and caring (That) is how...", will be discussed below as an example of *clause as message*.

Dawe	*is*	*committed*
Actor/carrier	process: being	attribute

she	*will see through to completion*	*any task*
Actor	process: material	Goal

In the second clause, Rowe is again the Actor, but is engaged in a material process with the company, IMP, as the participant to which the action is directed or extended (in functional grammatic terms, the Goal of the process). The second clause in the Dawe example is compound-complex; Dawe is first seen as the carrier of an attribute. Note that this is not an identifying process, as in 1a above (Rowe as THE quintessential [etc.] leader). This attribute is defined in the next clause "because..."; in this development, Dawe is the Actor in a material process.

Figure 3

he	*developed*	*IMP's (etc.)*
Actor	process: material	Goal

[she] (ellipsis)	*[is] (ellipsis)*	*caring*
Actor/carrier	process: being	attribute

she	*believes in*	*the basic worth (etc.)*
Actor/senser	process: mental	Phenomenon

In the third set of clauses, Rowe is again the Actor in a material process. Dawe, still being represented in a compound-complex structure, is seen first as the carrier of an attribute (again, not an identifying process); this attribute is defined in a clause in which Dawe is the Actor

in a mental process, that of cognition. Note the use of ellipsis, in which Dawe's presence is not stated, but assumed.

Figure 4

he	*has purchased and turned around*	*more than a dozen other companies*
Actor	process: material	Goal

She	*is*	*flexible, people-oriented*
Actor/carrier	process: being	attributes

In the next clause, Rowe is the Actor in compound material processes. Dawe is the carrier of (non-identifying) compound attributes.

Figure 5

The IMP Group	*boasts*	*1,500 employees and revenues (etc.)*
Actor	process: possession	Token

[she] (ellipsis)	*has*	*the ability to communicate with groups*
Actor/carrier	process: possession	attribute

In the final clauses, the Actor in the Rowe description shifts to Rowe's company[271]. The company is involved in a

---

[271] I think the argument is obvious that, by this point, the group of companies that Rowe has been seen to found, develop, purchase and turn around functions, as Actor, as a clear substitute for Rowe himself. It is to this effect

relational process, one of possession. That which the organization possesses functions as a descriptor of a referent: the company is the referent, and the employees/revenues belong to that referent and thus function, in terms of the theory, as Token. In the final clause of the Dawe example, Dawe is an Actor in possession of an attribute.

It should be obvious from the above that a 'commonsense' approach to REPRESENTATION pays scant attention to the details of language structure; but the question remains as to whether these details of representation have an impact on the listener/reader at a less than conscious level. A functional analysis of the excerpts throws the details of the respective representations into sharp relief:

1. Rowe is introduced as an Actor, Identified as "the quintessential hard-driving business leader"; Dawe's attributes, "Caring and committed" are introduced, while Dawe is the Target of other's description.

2. Rowe is engaged in material processes in the following three clauses; in four of the next five clauses Dawe is represented by processes of being and cognition.

3. While both paragraphs end with processes of possession, Rowe's Group possesses employees and revenues and Dawe possesses the attribute "the ability to communicate with groups."

4. When Rowe is discussed, he is present as Actor; Dawe is discussed once as Target and twice in ellipsis - where she is less present than assumed.

Thus, at an ideational level the Rowe example represents a material world, in which Rowe is an active participant. In the Dawe example the representation is of a world of mental and relational processes, in which Dawe's single material action is in fact metaphorical: she will "*see any task through*".

In considering CLAUSE AS EXCHANGE, the theory of functional grammar emphasizes the interactional quality of

---

that the company is anthropomorphized in the choice of verb "to boast".

communication, communication as an exchange of information or of "goods and services"[272]. The excerpts analyzed here constitute information exchanges and thus take the form of propositions.

Propositions are made arguable, that is, are given a point of reference from which they may be argued, through the Subject and the Finite; Subject and Finite together constitute the Mood of a clause, that upon which the action of the clause is predicated. The Subject is the element held responsible for the assertion, the one on whom rests the truth value of the assertion. The Finite element creates a point of reference for an assertion by means of polarity, tense and modality. Polarity is signaled in the positive or negative form of the verb: "he does, he doesn't; she is, she isn't." Tense specifies a temporal framework within which the proposition is located: "he did, she does". Modality refers to the speaker's judgment of the probability or obligation involved in her or his assertion: "He might, she should".

All of the clauses in the Rowe and Dawe excerpt presented here are expressed in the positive. The following figures list the clauses of the Rowe/Dawe example in terms of the elements of Subject and Finite (tense or modality).

Figure 6 - Kenneth Rowe

Kenneth Rowe	*is*
Subject	Finite: temporal operator, present

Rowe	*founded*
Subject	Finite: past

he	*developed*
Subject	Finite: past

---

[272] As in the case of requests and commands: "Please pass the salt" or "Give me that!" Halliday describes these instances as the use of linguistic means to non-linguistic ends (Halliday, 1985:, while information exchanges are ends in and of their linguistic selves. So to speak.

he	*has*	*purchased and turned around*
Subject	Finite: present[273]	Predicator

The IMP Group	*now*	*boasts*
Subject	Adjunct (time)	Finite: present

Figure 7 - Joan Dawe

(Committed and caring) That	*'s*
Subject	Finite: temporal operator, present

people	*describe*
Subject	Finite: present

Dawe	*is*
Subject	Finite: present

she	*will*
Subject	Finite: modal operator, probability

(she) [ellipsis]	*(is) [ellipsis]*
Subject	Finite: present

[273] The Finite here is present in relation to the speech event; in this example, the Predicator (the remainder of the verb group) specifies the time of the action other than in reference to the speech event (Halliday, 1985:79). Here, this constitutes past-in-present, narrated as "closer" in time than the simple past ("He developed...Since then he *has* purchased").

she	*believes*
Subject	Finite: present

she	*is*
Subject	Finite: present

(she) [ellipsis]	*has*
Subject	Finite: present

From the perspective of the CLAUSE AS EXCHANGE, it can be seen that the arguability or the truth value of the information offered is structured differently for Kenneth Rowe and for Joan Dawe. Rowe or his company are responsible for the assertions made, the majority of which reference action in the past; these actions, as was demonstrated above under REPRESENTATION, were material. In the Dawe example, the truth value in half of the clauses resides with Dawe; in the other half, responsibility for the assertion lies with others ("That's how/people describe"[274]) or with Dawe as not present but understood, through ellipsis. In the Dawe example, all of the propositions reference processes in the present, virtually all (seven out of eight) of which, as seen above, are not material but are mental or relational.

Underlining the relative materiality of the truth assertions of the two excerpts is the use of dates and numbers in the Rowe account, where mental processes predominate in the Dawe account. Quantifying Rowe's material actions are the temporal Adjuncts, "In 1967", "In 1970", and the Numeratives, "1,500" (employees) and "over $175 million" (revenues). Dawe's mental/relational processes are simply asserted.

The placement of the quantification of Rowe's actions leads to the final 'kind of meaning' expressed by the clause, the CLAUSE AS MESSAGE. This metafunction of the clause relates what is being said to the context of the

---

[274] The "test" which can be used in order to determine which element in the clause carries the ability to affirm or deny the assertion being made is in responding to the proposition with the tag question that would be appropriate in a dialogue. Thus, the response to *"Committed and caring. That's how..."* would be "Is it?"; to *"people describe Joan Dawe"* the tag question would be "Do they?"

surrounding speech, of the situation and of the surrounding discourse. The clause accomplishes this through its organization; the analysis of this function looks especially at what in the clause is taken as the point of departure. The element which realizes the point of departure in a clause is referred to as the Theme, while the remainder of the clause is the Rheme.

In the 'normal' case, the Theme is congruent with the Subject of the clause; in traditional grammar, this is noted in the ideal language sequence, subject/verb/object. When the Subject is congruent with the Theme, the Theme is said to be Unmarked: the message is unfolding in the 'normal' way and nothing unusual is going on. When the Theme is not in first position in the clause, it is said to be Marked. A Marked Theme calls attention to an aspect of the clause other than the Subject by putting it in first place. In this way, the organization of the clause tells the listener what is of particular significance. The connection between clauses, between the clause and the situation, between the clause and the discourse are thus established.

The following figures display the Themes of the Rowe/Dawe excerpts.

Figure 8

Kenneth Rowe	*is the quintessential (etc.)*
Theme (Unmarked)	Rheme

Rowe	*founded (etc.)*
Theme (Unmarked)	Rheme

In 1970	*he developed (etc.)*
Theme (Marked)	Rheme

Since then	*he has purchased (etc.)*
Theme (Marked)	Rheme

The IMP Group	*now*	*boasts (etc.)*
Theme (Unmarked)	(conjunctive)	Rheme

Figure 9

Committed and caring	*That's how (etc.)*
Theme (Marked)	Rheme

Dawe	*is committed*
Theme (Unmarked)	Rheme

because	*she*	*will (etc.)*
(conjunctive)	Theme (Unmarked)	Rheme

and	*caring*
conjunctive	Theme (Marked)

because	*she*	*believes (etc.)*
conjunctive	Theme (Unmarked)	Rheme

She	*is flexible (etc.)*
Theme (Unmarked)	Rheme

The analysis of the CLAUSE AS MESSAGE reinforces the differences noted earlier by displaying the lines of development in the two excerpts. In the Rowe example, the argument in the passage proceeds in a linear fashion from Rowe to his achievements, emphasized chronologically, to his organization. The Thematic structures in this way relate each clause to the preceding and the following clauses, but also relate the content of the excerpt to the surrounding discourse of the logical, task-oriented world of the "hard-nosed business leader."

The Thematic organization in the Dawe passage is from attribute to Dawe, and from Dawe to attribute; the excerpt constitutes description rather than argument or development. Whereas in the Rowe passage, Rowe appears in Thematic position as "Kenneth Rowe", as "Rowe" and the man behind "The IMP Group", Dawe appears once as "Dawe", three times as

"She" and twice as the woman behind the Committed and/or caring" attribute.

The following table illustrates a summary of the major grammatical structures which provide the "semantic choices" for each of these metafunctions and thus also provide the bases for the analysis of data. The point that the three metafunctions map onto a single clause is emphasized, by making reference to a single clause from each of the above examples. The first clause is an especially important clause to examine from the perspective of these metafunctions, because this clause introduces the passage as a whole. The following clauses can be seen to foreground the passages which follow in terms of ideational, interpersonal and textual content.

> *Kenneth Rowe is the quintessential hard-driving business leader.*
> *Committed and caring. That's how people describe Joan Dawe, executive director...*[275]

Table 3

METAFUNCTION	MEANING	STRUCTURE
Ideational (Actor)	clause as representation: *what the clause is about* • process • participant • circumstances	Transitivity *ex: "Kenneth Rowe is the quintessential"* *"people describe Joan..."*
CONTRAST: *Rowe* is Actor; *Dawe* is Target		

[275] These accounts in their entirety provide a wonderful example of the power of an analysis using functional grammar.

METAFUNCTION	MEANING	STRUCTURE
Interpersonal (Subject)	clause as exchange: *what the clause is doing* • statement • question • command • offer	Mood *ex: "Kenneth Rowe is..."* *"people describe..."*
CONTRAST: Truth value lies with *Rowe* versus with *"people"*		
Textual (Theme)	clause as message: *how message is organized, how it relates* • surrounding discourse • context of situation	Sequence *ex: "Kenneth Rowe is..."* *"Committed and caring. That's..."*
CONTRAST: Foregrounded is *Rowe* versus *"Committed and caring"*		

The emphasis on these metafunctions, the structural aspects of the clause, does not, of course, preclude attention to cohesive elements which create meaning at a level above that of the clause. Lexical cohesion (the repetition within an utterance of the same or similar words) and the use of conjunctions to signal logical relations between clauses (*and* x, *or* y, *however* z) are two examples of such elements; these are included in traditional analysis, as well as in the analysis here, and thus do not require lengthy exposition. But it is the combination of functions both at the level of the clause and above the level of the clause which together constitute the *texture* of the utterance. It is the understanding of this more complete perception of the comments of the speakers that is the goal of the second phase of the analysis; the analysis, keyed to the transcriptions of the speakers' utterances, is presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 6

SECOND THEMES: ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the utterances of the festival directors in response to the question "Do you think of yourself as a leader?" The analysis of these utterances follows the transcription and is keyed to the development and repetition of themes within and across utterances. The chapter concludes with the evaluation of this phase of the analysis by reference to the questions of the Chapter 2 critique.

The presentation of an analysis which makes use of the theoretical and methodological bases detailed above is, beyond all else, *long*. In the transcript excerpts which follow, the use of underlining, double underlining, and, occasionally, the removal of italics is intended to make it easier for the reader to read *quickly* through the excerpt before turning to the analysis.

As before, words or phrases receiving particular emphasis are typed in ALL CAPITALS, Ellipsis markers are used to indicate missing data. Words entered [in square brackets] have been supplied by the author. Speakers' initials, have been changed to preserve the anonymity of the speaker, as have any references to the specific festival being discussed, but correspond to those used previously.

The analysis presented here will follow the individual transcriptions and will begin with a description of how or whether the excerpt was determined to constitute an utterance. The analysis proceeds from there as a series of points which follow the development of the texture of the utterance; in this way the analysis can be read while referring to the transcript. In the analysis, themes which ultimately appeared most consistent across accounts are highlighted in bold.

Do you think of yourself as a leader?

cc: OK, leadership is,
it's very important,
it's a very important part of what I do.
I think especially in a volunteer organization,
good leadership is vital,
both leadership of the smaller team
it's important to be able
to inspire, motivate, and direct
that smaller group of people
and I think it's also important in the bigger picture
of leading the whole crew of volunteers
who will run the festival
even though many of them,
I might not know their names,
or recognize their faces again
if I saw them in the supermarket.
I think their perception of ME as leader
is more important than any interaction
which I might have with those individuals.
Going back to the smaller group,
the group of staff and coordinators,
I mean you know the [x] Festival,
they have a very similar system,
the coordinators and crews-
so I think, with that group,
given that we work on such a tight time table,
it's really important to lead everybody
through the few short weeks
between when they come on board
and the festival actually happens.
-- And it's interesting,
I haven't really thought about this (laugh),
in much detail before,
so it's interesting to just try and analyze
what goes on within this role. --
It's important both to lead and motivate,
but also to give freedom for people
to develop their roles and their positions
as they see fit, and as part of a bigger team.

And I think that's something
where I've tripped up in the past,
because of my own lack of time, and maybe experience,
not knowing exactly the right place to draw the line
between telling people the way that they SHOULD do it
and advising them of the way that they CAN do it.
And I think that
the more experienced leader in this specific situation
will know better
where those lines are drawn.
And, (big sigh) so, I think it's also important
to be perceived by outside agencies
as the leader of the organization,
as being in control,
and running a fairly tight organization,
or fairly well-managed organization,
and to be perceived as the one contact person
with the [x] Festival,
whatever the title is, producer or manager or whatever.
I think that's quite important.

1. Although this is a 1st level reduction, this speaker uses so much "you know" and repetition ("as, as, as in") that the tenor of the conversation appears very changed when the text is "cleaned up" and disfluencies are omitted. However, because the level of disfluency is much more obvious in transcription than it is in person, the reduction still seems a fair representation of the exchange.
2. Utterance: from where she begins her response to a clear ending: ("Um, do you want to give me some leading questions here? <laugh>..."). The phrase with which the speaker starts is mirrored at the end of the utterance ("it's very important"; "I think that's quite important"), serving as an entrance/exit marker[276].
3. The speaker doesn't begin with a yes/no response to "are you a leader", but rather starts with the term, "leadership is...".
4. The qualifier "I think" appears regularly as an interpersonal element of the Theme[277]; this tendency to

---

[276] Jefferson (1979), cited in Reissman (1993).
[277] The Theme, which introduces the starting point of the clause, always contains an ideational, or substantive, element (the topic) but may also include textual and interpersonal elements. In the example of "I think" as used here, the speaker is offering, at the level of the

qualify has been theorized as more typical of female speakers than of male. Gender differences did not appear in the first themes analyzed; will this appear as a theme here? This element is also easily lost or distorted in the process of "cleaning up" a transcription, thus original transcriptions would have to be checked against 1st level reductions before claims as to differences can be made.

5. The speaker quite clearly structures her response around major stakeholders ("Going back to the... smaller group" is a textual, organizational marker as part of the Theme) but moves quite rapidly in her comments to self-reflection ("I haven't really thought about this...."; "...something where I've tripped up in the past"). This element of self-reflection appears to function as if the speaker is **positioning against** her past self, in terms of time and/or experience. However, in the comments which follow: "the more experienced leader", the standard against which she positions herself is clearly this image of the more experienced leader.

6. This structure makes clear the distinction the speaker makes between the leadership of the small group ("inspire, motivate, direct"; "give freedom.. to develop roles") and leadership vis-à-vis the larger group of volunteers and outside agencies ("perception"; "perceived"). This distinction was instrumental in the previous phase of the analysis.

7. "I mean you know the x Festival" is a gesture toward involvement of the interviewer in the comments of the speaker. While I apprised all of the directors interviewed of my experience with festivals, this director was one of the few that I had met through festival work before beginning the research project; this kind of comment serves as a reminder that the identity or perceived identity of the

---

interpersonal exchange, her judgment of the validity or the likelihood of the information which follows. Halliday offers the following illustration of the potential for multiple Thematic elements:

on the other hand	maybe	on a weekday	it would be less crowded
textual	interpersonal	topical	
Theme			Rheme

interviewer is irretrievably bound up in the comments of the person being interviewed.

8. The textual element, "It's interesting" followed by "I haven't really thought about this before" signaled to me, each time I heard it on tape or came across it in the transcript, the potential effect of my questioning on the experience of the interviewees. Other interviewees, when I saw them after the initial interview, remarked that they had been thinking about what we had talked about.

9. Leadership is: inspire, motivate, direct; give freedom; create perception as leader, as being in control, as running a fairly tight, well-managed organization. Note that the previous analysis 'picked up' as thematic material clearly marked in lexico-grammatical items ("vocabulary" items).

qq: I think.. yes.
I think, coming from the kind of background I come from,
we tend to look for leaders
or leaders sort of just emerge anyway.
I think that you don't set out to become a leader,
you don't set out to take on a leadership role,
but somehow or the other,
if you have the energy,
you have the drive,
you have time <*LAUGHS*>
and you have the inclination *towards a certain kind of thing,*
whether it's in the arts as a festival or
whether it's in the area, for example,
of social justice, human rights,
you tend to take on a role of leadership
because, for some reason or the other
no one else is doing it
so you end up doing it.
Maybe just, to go back a little bit with regards to
immigrant groups, minority groups, multicultural groups,
whatever you want to call it,
it's almost the same.
Their terms are interchangeable perhaps.
I feel in Edmonton some of the more consistent people
with regards to issues,
working against racism, for example,
for social justice,
have been women.

And I'm not saying that
to minimize any of the work at all
that some of the men have done
But I have found that,
and without having to name names or anything like that,
that many of the men
that have been involved with the movement,
with the multicultural movement,
did so out of selfish reasons,
or, they were seeking, I guess, status, and things like that,
more so than perhaps the cause itself.

1. Utterance: from beginning of response to clear stop (request to shut off tape to make tea).
2. Qualifies her response at the outset ("I think" three times in rapid succession); this qualification shows up in attenuated fashion nearer the end of the utterance in the forms "I feel" and "I have found". The use, near the end, of "I guess" is most explicitly a qualification of the validity of the information given.
3. It is striking that this speaker immediately situates herself, as the first topic (Theme) of her response, in her background ("...coming from the kind of background I come from". She later specifies, in response to my further questioning, that she was referring to her background as coming from a colonial situation. "ii", who also identifies herself as coming from a colonized people, not only uses the notion of "coming from" to situate herself as a leader, but uses it as does this speaker, in initial position. Both women describe leadership in political terms. "Coming from" appears to be used as a marker of difference, a signal that the speaker is going to offer a contrast to the prevailing situation: think of the retort, "Where I come from...". This offering of a contrast can be thought of as **positioning against**, and works to situate the speaker against what the speaker sees as the prevailing position.
4. "You don't set out to become a leader" **positions against** "setting out to become a leader", which seems to make the goal (the "certain kind of thing" toward which one has an "inclination") paramount over power and influence ("noone else is doing it, so you end up doing it"); this seems especially to be the case in conjunction with the contrast she makes below between becoming involved for "selfish reasons" and working for "the cause."
5. A strong element of repetition (italics removed) throughout this speaker's comments creates a definite - in

linguistic terms, a "marked" - **rhetorical style**, emphasized with vocal intonation, and noticeable in that it differs from what I as listener hear as a "neutral" style. I became aware of this repetition when I was retranscribing the interview using the clause as text unit; at that point I realized that this was an element with which I had had difficulty not only in the interview with this speaker, but in that with another speaker whose culture of origin also differed significantly from mine. I had found this repetition off-putting in person: I thought of it as "preachy", and because of my own (anti)religious background, was wary, at a somewhat less than conscious level, of being condescended to or harangued. In print, I found the repetition dramatic, effective, even moving.

6. Leadership requires: energy, drive, time, inclination, and "no-one else is doing it, so you do it". This seems, in the light of the next point, to be especially descriptive of social justice-oriented leadership, but taken at face value is also an apt description of competitive advantage "no-one else is doing it".

7. She associates what I assumed was unproblematically an "ethnic festival" with "social justice, human rights". This is connected even more firmly when she refers to "immigrant/minority/multicultural" "issues" such as "racism, social justice" as part of "the movement, ...the multicultural movement." This element, too, had conspired to make me feel that the interview was going to be of questionable worth: this wasn't sounding like a "real" festival.

8. The stance she takes here that the various terms for diverse communities are "interchangeable perhaps", is in exact opposition to that taken by "pp", who began the interview by making a point about the confusion and symbolism in the terminology of diversity.

> *pp: [I] just would like to make the point,*
> *even the literature, and in the references,*
> *when people talk about minorities, their subconsciousness,*
> *whether they realize it or not,*
> *is not thinking of the non-white, non-European.*
> *They are thinking of women,*
> *but the women they are thinking are European white women.*
> *In minorities when they consider,*
> *it does not take into consideration even the non-white males,*
> *let alone the non-white females.*

So the situation is, first of all, the non-white males have to catch
up with the white females,
[...] for any kinds of consideration.
And the non-white females have to catch up
with the non-white males and the white females.
And that's the size of it.
If you are talking, then, [...] about ethnic group,
THEN whenever they're talking about ethnic group
it's like they're not talking about anything
that relates to the white majority.
It's strictly the non-white group
that they are referring to,
which means male and female.
So this is an unfortunate distinction,
but that's the way it is.

9. The association of the leadership question to male/female differences did not occur entirely independently on the part of the speaker - I did mention up front that I was interested especially in talking to women and to minority-group men. But this strong negative evaluation of "many of the men" in the multicultural movement was certainly not something I expected to elicit. The speaker clearly **positions** herself **against** "many of the men" for the reasons set out below.

10. The utterance ends with the contrast between taking on leadership role for "selfish reasons", "status" with leadership out of concern for "the cause itself"; this forms the basis on which she **positions against** other leaders. This ending might be rendered more ambiguous if I had transcribed the rising intonation with which this last phrase was accompanied in the text: "more so than perhaps the cause? itself?". The placement of "the cause itself" in final position gives it the prominence (tonic accent) accorded to the "new information" portion of the message in spoken English[278]. But its enunciation, with a rising, questioning intonation makes the offering of this information tentative. While this intonation is associated

---

[278] Halliday provides a discussion of intonation and rhythm, but it is rather too obscure to be useful, in my opinion, beyond the point made here: new information tends to be provided in last position in the clause, where a tonic accent tends to fall.

with a feminine tentativeness in speech, it seems to me also to have geographic and cultural associations which may not be read quite so unproblematically as expressing submissiveness and tentativeness. On the other hand, the rising intonation could signal a tentativeness which follows from the "I guess", qualifying the attribution of baser motivations to the men being discussed.

11. As with the use of repetition, the textual, cohesive elements of this account may differ from the organization I hear as "neutral" and "sensible", and thus may constitute another dimension for misunderstanding in the interview and in the analysis. On the whole, the organization of this speaker's account may be seen to contrast with that of the previous account. "cc" made use of the concept of stakeholders as an organizing theme in her comments; each group was mentioned in turn, with her comments about the leadership of each. There was, in the first account, a distinct lexical coherence achieved through repetition of the word "important" and the related item "vital". In this second account, the coherence seems more allusive than structural. Compare, for example, the use of the textual references in the two accounts, "Going back to the" and "to go back a little bit". In the first account, it was clear to me that "cc" was making a reference back to the first stakeholder group she mentioned. In the second account, I was puzzled by the reference "back to" "immigrant groups, minority groups" and assumed that the speaker was mistakenly referring back to something she had thought, but had not said out loud. Reading the transcript again, it seems that "qq" could easily be referring to her initial "positioning" as a member of an "immigrant group, minority group", or to her reference to the "area... of social justice, human rights."

Nor does "qq"'s text progress through an overt organizing theme; in this way the differences in the two texts are like those described by Reissman in research which explores contrasting narrative styles employed by an Anglo and a Puerto Rican speaker; particularly noteworthy in her analysis is the apparent lack of understanding, captured on tape, that the style of the latter speaker occasioned for the interviewer[279].

---

[279] Reissman (1987, 1988)

> Other research is beginning to suggest that forms of telling may vary with class and cultural background. For example, we know from recent research in education that the black and white children use different narrative structures and that white classroom teachers have difficulty "hearing" narratives of black children because of the way they are organized...In interpreting interviews with women, failure to attend to different narrative styles is particularly consequential for it limits understanding of diversity, and may accentuate the class and cultural divisions between women that feminists have tried so hard to diminish.[280]

When I looked more closely at the organization of this utterance, I focused on what I initially saw as a lack of parallel structure between opening and closing statements. But considering that "qq" began her remarks with a reference to a colonial situation, the negative emphasis at the end on "seeking status" rather than working for "the cause" can be understood as closely connected to the opening theme: in a colonial situation, a people who "look for leaders" and are met with someone who "sets out to become a leader" (opening statements), and who does so for "selfish reasons", "seeking status", are met with betrayal and exploitation.

The organizing principle here is episodic and implicit. Whereas the structure of "cc"'s comments is linear and explicit, the development of the theme in "qq"'s account takes place within discrete episodes, the relations between which must largely be furnished by the listener. The association of this narrative ordering with minority cultural groups, and of linear and temporal ordering with North American Anglo culture, is congruent with the work of Reissman and of others whom she cites[281]. Note that what is highlighted by means of textual markers and structural patterns with which I am familiar ("cc"'s distinction between the leadership of small and large groups) was 'picked up' by and highlighted in the seemingly neutral analysis of the previous chapter.

ii: I come from a philosophy that
I don't believe

---

[280] Reissman (1988:152)

[281] Reissman (1988); Reissman cites Michaels (1981) and Michaels & Cazden (1986) in this regard.

that anyone should be leaders
unless we're all leaders -
I truly believe that.
And so, I have the kind of relationship
with the staff and volunteers,
where it's more collaborative work
than one person taking the authority
and I try to do business
in a very collective manner, using consensus.
We meet every Monday morning,
and we check in,
we connect with each other,
what went well,
what's not going so well,
what do we need help with, or whatever.
And so (big sigh), I guess if I were
to define leadership in my own role,
that's how I would define it,
by empowering leadership throughout the organization,
with individuals at whatever level they're at,
and making sure that
there's assignments, or directives, or support
for them to be leaders in their own way.

1. Utterance: from the beginning of her response, omitting only an initial orientation question ("I think that was the question?"), to a clear stop ("What was the other question?").
2. "I come from" in first position, as with "qq"(above), situates her immediately in a context **positioned against** the prevailing context. Unlike the example of "qq", this context is not defined as place or culture of origin, but as "a philosophy".
3. The notion that there should be no leaders "unless we're all leaders" is bracketed by active forms of the verb "to believe". This notion is **positioned against** that of a single authority figure, illustrating the prevailing context countered by the speaker's "philosophy".
4. Because of this philosophy, these beliefs, ("And so") she has a "relationship" with staff and volunteers which is "more collaborative". "Collaborative" is defined as contrasting to "one person taking the authority". In a

parallel structure ("And so, I have...[and so][282], I try"), because of this philosophy and these beliefs she tries "to do business in a very collective manner" which is defined as "using consensus."
5. These assertions are then illustrated with a series of declarations in which the subject switches from "I" to "we": "We meet," "we check in," "we connect."
6. The structure of this passage is explicit and symmetrical. The speaker begins with a general statement of her position. The consequence of her philosophy is given ("And so"), followed by an illustration ("We meet, we check in, we connect". Her definition of leadership then is posited as conditional upon her philosophy and behaviour ("And so")[283], which is also accompanied by an illustration ("making sure that there's assignments [etc.]").

ff: Oh, very much so.
You have to be, you MUST be a strong organizer in order to put a function like this on.
You also have to be a good people-person,
you have to be able to work with people, at every level, because you're working with volunteers all down the line.
The board of directors are all volunteers.
And you're working with, in this case, to put this festival on, we've got over [x number of] volunteers.
And you have to be a strong people-person as well as an organizer.
You have to be able to play the game with these people, particularly with all of the diverse ethnic organizations that we deal with.
You have to be able to deal with 'em and work with 'em.

1. Utterance: From his immediate response to the question to my asking the next question. This man began making very interesting comments before I could get the tape turned on; when the recording begins, I was following up on

---

[282] The parallel structure set up between the two clauses here enables the conjunctive element "and so" to be presupposed in the second clause by ellipsis.
[283] The textual element "and so" can be described in functional grammatical terms as a conjunctive form of cohesion which is causal-conditional (Halliday, 1985:302-305).

his comment about running the festival like a business (see item 10 below).
2. The speaker's immediate response is not only an affirmative, but it is intensified ("very much so.")
3. The use of "you" instead of the personal pronoun "I" is striking in this speaker's talk. Here, this usage renders this less a personal discussion than it is a series of truths: not "I have," "I try," "we meet," "we connect," as in "ii" (above), but "you must be," "you have to be".[284]
4. Note that nearly all verbs are in the obligatory mode - these are not only truths, they are requisite truths. The two uses of a pronoun other than the general "you", neither of which take the imperative, signal moves from the level of general, requisite truth to specific fact: "in this case...we've got over [x number of] volunteers", "organizations that we deal with."
5. A leader has to be "a strong organizer" and "a good people-person". The first reason that "you" have to be good with people is that the organization is composed of volunteers, from the board of directors "all down the line". A "strong people-person" is able to "play the game with these people", "deal with 'em" and "work with 'em".
6. The second reason that one has to be a "strong people-person" is that the festival deals with "diverse ethnic organizations." The only intensification other than the initial response ("Are you a leader?" "Oh, very much so") is in reference to the need to be able to "play the game with these people, particularly with all of the diverse ethnic organizations".
7. Implied in the last two points is the assumption that volunteers and diverse ethnic organizations require more "people-oriented" leadership skills than average.
8. When doing the interview, I found the conjunction of "play the game", "these people, particularly", and "deal with 'em" vaguely derogatory. I could not at the time, and cannot still, pin down these slightly negative impressions,

---

[284] The use of the general "you" can be interpreted as bearing different connotations. One version sees the usage as connoting alienation and impersonality, another, somewhat opposed, as indicating objectivity or universality. The second connotation is the one I sense here, since the speaker elsewhere refers to his experience owning and running a large business: he seems anything but alienated in his work.

which were balanced by some strong positive impressions of his caring for his work.

9. The structure of this utterance is simple and compound. The conjunction of organization skills and people skills is minimally elaborated on, with cohesion evident in the repetition of strong/good/organizer/people-person. "Volunteers" and "people" are also repeated. Repetition, simplicity, brevity, and the use of the simple declarative characterized this speaker's remarks quite consistently.

10. The theme of **positioning against** did not only occur with racial or cultural minorities. Here, this director began (as noted above, before he answered the question "Are you a leader?") by positioning himself against what he saw as the prevailing attitude among Edmonton festival directors:

> *km: So, you said that YOU treat this as a business, this festival?*
>
> *ff: I'm a staunch believer*
> *that actually EVERY festival should be treated as a business.*
> *Yes, we're in the entertainment business, if you will,*
> *and we're lending a cultural component to our own communities.*
> *By the same token, there's a tremendous economic spin-off*
> *as a result of organizing these festivals*
> *and you have to, in order to stay in, IN BUSINESS, so to speak,*
> *you have to treat it as a business.*
> *And, I come from a business-engineering background*
> *and as a result, I like to think of this as a business.*

Although he places himself, because of his background, in contrast to "the average" or "the other" festival directors (and this seemed strongly apparent to me at the time), he does close his comments by referring back to the group of festival directors in Edmonton:

> *ff: but I think you're going to find a common thread*
> *in talking to all of the festivals*
> *that you've got to be a leader*
> *in order to put these things together.*

That this comment meshes neatly with that of the next speaker will be apparent below.

aa: Yeah, I do,
but I DON'T THINK
that you live day-to-day
thinking of yourself in those terms
and I DON'T THINK you,
particularly in this kind of a crazed endeavour,
go into it thinking in terms of leadership
as a word or as a concept.
I did a workshop a few years ago
with a woman named [111]
who runs the [x] Festival,
and it was on and for people
who were thinking of initiating festivals,
particularly in small towns,
and were from all over Alberta.
So she and I got together before the workshop
to figure out
what we were going to say,
and we wanted to figure out
what was necessary to start a festival.
And we determined that
the first thing that was necessary
was one crazed individual.
So it's just somebody
who usually,
for whatever their motivation,
is determined
and almost compulsive
about a vision that they have
or an idea that they have
and then they just make it happen.
So, in retrospect they provide the leadership
to make it happen.
I'M NOT SURE THAT
they follow any prescribed academic methodology -
god knows, I certainly didn't.
So maybe a book on leadership might in retrospect
fit the profile of festival coordinators,
or producers, or whatever they are.
But I DON'T THINK leadership is motivation.
I think the motivation usually has to do
with an almost unstoppable drive
to accomplish whatever it might be.
Whether it might be
presenting the world's best folk music
or whether it means

bringing in international talent to a place,
focusing on jazz,
or in our case the [performers of x].
One of the definitions of festivals,
as I perceive festivals,
is that it's a suspension
of normal rules of behaviour.
So, in order to accomplish that suspension
you're usually running counter to prevailing laws,
or attitudes, or norms.
Again I'M NOT SURE
that you think in those terms
when you're thinking in terms
of what you want to do.
And when people individually,
or institutions, or government,
tell you how crazy
or impractical or impossible the idea is,
chances are
that probably just makes you
more determined than ever
to make it happen.
And I guess making anything happen
that requires a large amount of effort,
and the coalescing of talents,
whether they be volunteer talents,
or staff talents, or talents of the art form
that you're focusing on,
'cause I'm involved with arts festivals,
then some leadership qualities are necessary,
but I DON'T THINK we ever sit down
and think about them as leadership qualities.
I think it's more:
you get on the horse and lead the charge.
But you never think -
I'm going to lead the charge,
you just, you start making the phone calls,
and writing the letters,
and talking like crazy,
and making everybody understand
that your idea is valid,
and making it happen.
In terms of how I perceive myself
when asked the question,
yeah, I mean, I would like to think
I'm not being self-aggrandizing,

but I am a leader.
I've always been a leader.
I didn't train for it.
I didn't want it to happen.
I think I just probably have
that kind of personality and brain,
and I'm aggressive
and I'm assertive
and I believe strongly in certain things,
and I'm always opinionated
and I got a big mouth, an (smile).
So, history will show I guess
that, yeah, I'm a leader,
'cause I've been able ta,
one way or another,
with the help of a lot of people,
but basically acting as their catalyst,
make this sucker happen
and bring it to wherever it is -
it's certainly a far cry from
what it was.
And I've just always been asked
to chair things
or be president of things,
and I like to drive rather than be driven.
And I think that human beings just fall
into certain natural categories -
there are passive people,
there are active people.
And I think
that certainly the people
that I know within the festival industry,
and that's what it's becoming,
are a unique brand of people,
almost all of them would have to
be deemed leaders
or they couldn't do
what they're doing.

1. Start/stop: from initial response to pause, where I introduced another question. This speaker's talk was constituted for the most part by long, unbroken utterances; this one is not atypical in length.
2. The speaker begins with an affirmative in, characteristically for him, the casual form, "yeah". The use of a casual, vernacular style of speaking seems to

function as part of this speaker's explicit **positioning against** the dominant culture as a member of a 60's - style "counter culture". This point is elaborated below.

3. In referring to the festival as "a crazed endeavour", the speaker foreshadows both the punch line of the narrative into which he enters at the end of this clause complex and the thematic element which this narrative introduces - that of "the one crazed individual". This theme is discussed below, and resurfaces in the accounts of "11", to whom the speaker refers here.

4. He stresses that leadership is not something he or, later, other festival directors think about, as a "word or as a concept", either on a "day-to-day" basis or before taking action (one doesn't "go into it thinking" in these terms). Later in this utterance he specifies that one leads "the charge. But you never think - I'm going to lead the charge." Nor does he believe that festival directors "ever sit down and think about" leadership qualities. Thus leadership and leadership qualities (detailed below) appear to be (a) less than conscious because (b) they are subordinated to the primary purpose, "a vision or an idea" about which the actor is "almost compulsive."

5. "I did a workshop a few years ago...": the speaker quickly turns to a narrative example to illustrate his point. The example ends at "the first thing that was necessary was..." Here, the major point is made at the end of the narrative, using a dramatic, "punch line" structure. The use of such narratives is typical in this person's talk; it is also a narrative style to which I responded. As noted above, under "qq", was there a tendency for me to highlight in the first phase of the analysis those themes which were structured in ways most like the patterns of my own talk? The speaker also repeatedly uses the textual marker "So" to structure his comments; the pattern established is one of logical progression. The theme of the crazed individual was one which captured my attention and which I saw as a significant part of the third major category of responses.

6. The notion of "one crazed individual" reappears throughout the interview. This "determined," "almost compulsive" individual is proposed as a more fitting descriptor of a festival director than "leader" because, among other things, the crazed individual does not "follow any prescribed academic methodology". This compulsive individual may "in retrospect" fit a leadership profile; in fact, at the end of this passage, the speaker guesses that "history will show" that he, the speaker and one of the

models for the concept of "the crazed individual", is a leader.

7. One of the characteristics of the "crazed individual" is the presence, in addition to leadership qualities , of a certain kind of motivation. This motivation is "an almost unstoppable drive to accomplish whatever it might be", although the speaker refers primarily to the arts.

8. Another key concept in this speaker's talk is the notion of "running counter to prevailing laws, or attitudes, or norms", to my mind a clear expression of **positioning against**. Although here the notion is connected with the speaker's definition of festivals, it plays a more general role in the discussion as time goes on. This "counter-culture" issue appears to be loosely associated with the idea of the "crazed individual", whose vision or idea is regarded by other "people..., institutions or governments" as "crazy or impractical or impossible." It becomes clear in this speaker's comments that there are strong associations between the "crazed individual", the counter-culture version of the speaker himself

> *aa: So, in my case,*
> *I mean, I've never really analyzed myself that carefully,*
> *but it was the times I grew up in*
> *and all kinds of circumstances led me to a situation*
> *where I never wanted to get into a nine to five thing.*
> *I hated ties*

and a notion of moral superiority

> *aa: So, you've got the downtown business association*
> *determined to take advantage of that funding,*
> *and put a face on downtown,*
> *'cause that's their mandate,*
> *not to run events,*
> *it's to stimulate the downtown for shopping.*
> *And again if you were to take kind of a look at*
> *what is produced there*
> *and put it against any of the existing festivals,*
> *ah, I personally would find what they 're doing wanting.*

The moral superiority inherent in the subordination of leadership to a vision or an idea, as voiced here, resonates with the contrast in "qq" between leadership for selfish reasons and leadership for "the cause".

9. The notion of being "crazed" and "running counter to" also seem to be associated with the stylistic theme of vernacular language: note words and phrases in the passage that are not italicized. (This point is taken up below under 13). Again, this is a rhetorical style to which I am quite sympathetic.

10. In talking about "leadership qualities" the speaker returns to the theme that festival directors don't "think about them as leadership qualities". When he explains that rather than think about "leading the charge", you lead the charge, "you just, you start making the phone calls... and talking like crazy and making everybody understand... and making it happen" he again makes leadership subordinate to the achievement of the idea.

11. The speaker explicitly signals his move from a general description of leading ("you start making... writing... talking...") to a more personal level: "In terms of how I perceive myself when asked the question....". He makes a quartet of short, simple, declarative statements: "I am a leader, I've always been a leader. I didn't train for it, I didn't want it to happen." That these assertions are structured rhetorically as the 'unadorned truth' follows from his the fact that he "would like to think " he's "not being self-aggrandizing".

The effect created is one in which his leadership occurred involuntarily, arbitrarily, inevitably. This compares to "qq" above ("you don't set out to become a leader"). It also compares to "mm" below (leadership is imposed on the individual by others); "mm" makes a very similar set of statements about the artist as leader:

> *mm: and yet, these people also recognize their responsibility as leaders too.*
> *And* - they never asked *for it,*
> they didn't write *that song*
> *or make that piece of clay sculpture,*
> and continue to *make work,*
> and continue to *give back to their students,*
> and continue to *share with everyone around them,*
> *for any other reason*
> *except: that's the way*
> *that they chose to live.*
> *So then, one day they wake up and realize,*
> *well, people look at me as a leader.*
> *Well, that's THEIR problem (laugh)*

Note that both speakers use repetition and emphatic declaratives as a marked **rhetorical style** in association with this theme.

12. The speaker lists several of the qualities which mark him as a leader: he's aggressive and assertive, he believes strongly, he's opinionated, he has "a big mouth", he acts as a catalyst and he makes "this sucker happen", he's asked to chair and preside, he prefers driving to being driven. These qualities "of personality and brain" cause people to "fall into certain natural categories", passive and active. The uses of the descriptor "natural" are varied across accounts.

13. Here in the listing of leadership qualities, as throughout the interview, it can be noted that the speaker uses substandard English grammar and vocabulary for humorous purposes or for emphasis: " I got a big mouth, an' ..." was a humorous reference; "make this sucker happen" was said quite seriously. Whether serious or humorous, the use of the vernacular - language which ignores or subverts standard rules of language - is linked to the theme of the individual who runs counter to societal expectations.

14. Throughout the interview the speaker repeatedly links the idea that being "opinionated," believing strongly, and having "a big mouth" are part of being a successful "crazed individual", that is, a leader who is sufficiently motivated to make a festival happen.

15. The speaker's reference to "the festival industry" is echoed later in the interview in his discussion of the various associations which have been formed by different groupings of festivals: art festivals, Alberta festivals, Edmonton festivals.

16. The speaker begins to wrap up his answer to "are you a leader" by repeating, "Yeah, I'm a leader," and by asserting that "almost all" of the directors of the various festivals are "a unique brand" and "would have to be deemed leaders." As was pointed out above, this is markedly similar to the statement made by the previous speaker at the end of his interview.

17. The use of the qualifiers "I think" and "I guess" is very interesting in this account. These are used perhaps four times as simple qualifiers in thematic position, informing the listener, on the level of an interpersonal exchange of information, of the speaker's judgment of the slightly weakened reliability of what follows. This sort of element is used twice more in conjunction with the comment that he "would like to think" he's "not being self-

aggrandizing" when he talks about himself as a leader; in this vein, the qualifiers "I think," "I guess" work as gentle disclaimers, softening the potentially "aggrandizing" effect of claims to be a leader. In at least seven instances, such qualifiers are used in the negative, "I don't think", "I'm not sure" (in small capitals in the excerpt). In these cases the speaker might be seen to be **positioning against** what he is positing as an academic view of leadership. It is consistent with Bakhtin's theory of the utterance being formed always in response to an other that the speaker constructs a large portion of his comments around what he imagines to be his listener's perception of leadership - "a prescribed academic methodology."

ee: [begins by mentioning explicit areas of responsibility within his organization][285]
[In respect of...
namely...
specifically]
they channel up through my area of operation.
And, so somebody has to be responsible for them
and I guess they fall within my territory.
So if there's ever any questions asked about them,
if there's things that have to
be taken to the board of directors
or if things have to be coordinated,
it comes through me.
But I always look upon myself
as being more of a super coordinator
than a leader particularly,
but ultimately decisions have to be made
and yes, I have to make those decisions, so...
Except the tough ones,
I don't make the tough decisions (laugh).

[KM: No? (laugh) Who do you give them to?]

ee: I blame them on committees.

---

[285] This discussion, amounting to about 90 words, must be omitted to preserve the anonymity of the organization and speaker.

[KM: That's good, that's what committees are for.]

ee: Right.
No, I do make decisions
and I think the interesting thing about leadership,
I remember when
I first came into this particular position,
and that's eight years ago,
I was really pretty nervous
and I really wasn't quite sure
whether I was qualified
to sort of do all this sort of stuff.
And there was a lot more hesitancy
about what I was doing,
but now I feel pretty confident
in the direction we're going.
And so it's a little bit easier
to sort of make definitive answers about things,
certain times,
and so if that's what leadership's all about,
I guess I handle that,
although, like I said,
really, there is a huge team
involved in this whole thing.
And what we try to do as much as anything
is involve that grass roots type of involvement,
both from volunteers
and from our staff component,
to sort of bring things up to the top,
and then ultimately there's A FEW OF US
sort of sit around
and WE SAY OK, yeah,
this is
what WE'RE GOING TO DO this year,
or this is
what gate prices are going to be,
or these will be the promotions
WE CONCENTRATE ON,
those types of things.
Or this is what WE'RE GOING TO DO
that's different from last year.
And uh, so WE DO HAVE conversations,
but somebody has to sort of, as I say,
coordinate those discussions, I guess,
and that tends to be me.

1. Utterance: from beginning of his response to my next question. The pause for a joke, and for my response to the joke, was followed by what seemed clearly to constitute a continuation of his response.
2. It is striking that, in response to the question "do you consider yourself a leader", this speaker begins with an excursus on the parent organization. The structure of the 3 part introduction to the parent organization is clear: the speaker moves from the industry, to the various aspects of the organization, to the specific production which he oversees.
3. But, after focusing down to his particular domain ("namely", "specifically"), the speaker then begins to equivocate: "they channel up through my..."; "somebody has to be responsible for..."; "I guess they fall within my...". Note that in these constructions the only agent specified is "somebody", and that the third is qualified, by "I guess." This style continues through another list, paralleling the parent organization lists with which he starts but this time covering his responsibilities: "if there's", "if there's", "if things have to be", all agent-less constructions. This list concludes, in a dramatic "punch line" construction, with yet another passive: "it comes through me."
4. When he finally does mention the word "leader," it is in a construction which is left incomplete: he sees himself as "more of a super-coordinator than a leader particularly, but ultimately decisions have to be made, and yes, I have to make those decisions, so..." The logical completion of the ellipsis would be "so, I am a leader," but this remains unsaid.
5. An incomplete sentence follows his next mention of the word "leadership": "the interesting thing about leadership, I remember when I first...". The speaker confides his initial nervousness, and hesitancy when coming into his position, but when he moves to statements about his present confidence, the content of the message is rendered ambiguous by the multiple qualifications he includes in the structure: "And so it's a little bit easier to sort of make definitive answers about things, certain times, and so if that's what leadership's all about, I guess I handle that, although, like I said, really there is a huge team...". In fact, the original version of the transcription at this point makes the speaker's hesitancy even more striking: "and uh, so uh, if, if that's what leadership's all about, I guess, I, I handle that".

6. One of the reasons the speaker hesitates to refer to himself as a leader might appear in the opposition between one person providing "definitive answers" and there being "a huge team involved". But immediately after mentioning "involve /grass roots/ involvement", the speaker turns to a hierarchical metaphor ("bring things up to the top") which he refines by saying "ultimately there's a few of us", neatly balancing participation with direction.
7. The speaker returns a final time to the question of whether or not he is a leader when he refers to the discussion of policies, prices and promotions among "a few of us" at "the top": "but somebody has to coordinate those discussions, I guess, and that tends to be me." Again the presence of hesitancy is stronger in the original transcription: "that tends to be uh, me".
8. I think it is important to note that the speaker did not strike me as a particularly hesitant person. He seemed calm and self-assured, and though I didn't realize the extent to which he equivocated in his responses at the time, during the interview I did have an impression of him as being comfortable with a somewhat "down home", "just folks" persona. I think his joke, coming early on in the interview, seemingly to put both of us at ease, displays this well. Was his humility a bit put on, in order to make me comfortable? One factor balancing the equivocation evident in transcription is the use of "I" throughout the interview, rather unequivocally as Actor and as Subject. The only major shift is when the speaker refers to "a few of us" at "the top"; at that point the Actor and Subject switch to "we".

Alternatively, I found myself wondering if the organization is such that a posture other than that of humility is unwise? The fact that he began his answer to "Are you a leader?" with a description of the size and breadth of the parent organization might argue for the interpretation that in the context of a large and politicized parent organization, the concept "leadership" was not widely used in association with a position such as his. For example, he later explained to me that some of the festival's more senior volunteers wield considerable power, forming "mini board[s] of directors". In any case, that he began his response with the parent organization makes it appear that he is **positioning against** that organization in order to define leadership as it applies to him.

(In response to the question)
GROUP: <LONG PAUSE>

oo1: Maybe it's just that "leader" isn't the right word.

oo2: I [FELT?] THAT we sort of tried
to do more leadership by interest area,
or expertise, or function,
as in this oval here [refers to sketch she made]
with all of us sort of around the oval
in different areas of the festival
that needed work, right?
And so, we sort of decided
who was gonna sort of generally
take leadership in each of the areas,
whether it was outreach to other groups,
whether it was the workshops of the festival,
whether it was the [festival activity]
whether it was the [festival activity],
the publicity, the finances,
whatever our key areas were.
We decided to get one of us
to take some leadership there,
in that skill or interest area,
bring in some people to help them
if they needed to,
like have little committees,
work with the staff,
who were the CRITICAL organizers
and in essence leaders on some level.
but not to have somebody being a leader
in the sense of giving orders. <LAUGHS>
And, so it was more like a cooperation
with people taking some leadership
in different areas,
and I think
that it meant also trusting and respecting
that people WERE gonna take leadership
in those areas,
and even letting people make mistakes
in those areas,
even if it wasn't perfect,
like even if you thought,
Well, maybe I could do that better,
or I know what needs to be done in that area.
Instead of rushing in

and saying - Do this!
this is the way it should be done.
I felt like in this group,
more than ANY that I've worked in many ways,
that there was
room to say what you thought
but it wasn't a push or a shove
in, in the sense of being disrespectful?
but it was very much more of a situation
where people threw into the table
what our options were.
We sort of said,
Oh, well that sounds good,
you in publicity -
can you take it and run?
And that it was very much
a collective leadership model THAT WORKED.

oo3: I GUESS IF I WAS
TO MAKE a distinction in process
I would make a distinction I think
between collaboration and collective?
because one of the reasons
why I participated was
because in sort of a community development,
theoretical concept,
the process that was used
was collaboration?
and then working towards consensus.
So, it wasn't cooperative -
it was collaborative.
Everybody came on and participated
and had equal access to participate
in the decision making.
Now the choice of whether or not they wanted
to participate was up to them.
But the skills and the talents went on the table
at the appropriate time
as they came up in the development of the work
that had to be done.
I remember when we were doing the structure
and then the job description of the group
that's in the middle,
and put that in motion,
that we were very careful to describe the process
and I think the word "collaborative" was used

quite carefully in that process.
And determining the lines
of accountability and responsibility,
they were laid out very carefully, too.
Briefly but carefully <LAUGHTER>

oo4: I THINK it's been much more successful
THIS year than other years
because in fact, we didn't try for consensus
with every decision
as we have in other years.
And that -
the interesting thing
about the [x] steering committee every year,
and our staff,
there's a lot of strong women
that have been involved,
and often on a steering committee,
there would be people
who were running their agencies
or, people who were already leading something
in their own vocation.
So, coming to the table,
we had all of these very strong women
who had lots of vested interests
just because they were
used to leading, or running something.
And when we tried
to have consensus with that group,
all sorts of power struggles kept happening.
But I think having set it up THIS way THIS year,
people were allowed
to take responsibility for certain things
without having to come to consensus with everything.
We collaborated.
Collaboration is a perfect word
because I think
we all took responsibility for certain areas
but we all didn't have to decide everything either,
which was belabouring
and actually very difficult
when it's an event
that has to have certain decisions
made at certain times
and you can't get everyone together,
and if you don't,

everyone expects that
they should've been in on the decision, -
So this was, I think, a much smoother process,
and accommodated people
who are- consider themselves to be leaders,
or consider themselves to have very loud voices,
I think sometimes
our voices are quite loud around the table,
and our vested interests are loud,
so, it worked well.

* * * * *

oo5: But when I hear the word "leader", too,
lots of hierarchy and patriarchy things come up for me
when I hear that,
so I don't know
that I would use "leader" very much.
The word "leadership"
I like a little bit better
because I think
we all did take a little bit of leadership
but the word "leader" to me has connotations
that probably I wouldn't choose to use very much.

oo4: It's a word that
we've been VERY careful about every year
NOT to use,
and in fact, the whole issue of power,
I mean, we would often talk about power,
and there were power conflicts in other years.
but we really avoided
using "leader" as a word, ever.

oo1: 'Cause it requires
that everyone else is followers, I suppose.

1. Utterance: from the initial question to my second question. A later passage is included. In this second passage, a woman who hadn't spoken before reintroduced the question of the use of the term "leader"; this seemed a return to the focus of this initial discussion (see below).
2. The group's philosophy, emphasizing the equal status and participation of all members, did not prevent some

members from speaking noticeably more than others. Three of the most voluble seemed well aware of their propensity to dominate the discussion, either acknowledging this directly ("I think, sometimes our voices are quite loud"; "I'm sort of a naturally bossy person <LAUGHTER> and I want to take it over, but everybody knows that, right?"[286]), or addressing the group as if for permission to speak (as in the first few lines here, when the speaker asked, "right?", she turned to glance around the table at the others). In all, this type of interaction seemed to signal that, because individuals had varying propensities to dominate the discussion, explicit attention to the interpersonal element of communication was the norm. But, in spite of this attention, some negotiating of the right to speak/ the right to speak for, took place (see below). By the end of the interview, I believe that everyone did take an opportunity to contribute more than once.

3. I did at the time, however, note a slight inclination toward a **rhetorical style** which was a bit more forceful than the average in the group in this particular speaker (where italics are removed). I interpreted this as evidence of her being comfortable with "holding the floor" in a group discussion. Would I have been less comfortable if this speaker had shown an even higher degree of a declamatory **rhetorical style**, as in the cases of the minority women speakers? I can't be sure.

4. An emphasis on language ("maybe...'leader isn't the right word") is immediately and directly established. "Leadership" appears to be the substitute of choice for "leader", with an indirect focus established by the choice of verb: the speaker in this initial passage and oo5 in the later passage refer to "doing" or "taking" leadership - rather than "being a leader", which is used in a negative example farther along in this speakers' account. This attenuation of a possessive connotation of leadership is further accomplished by the accompaniment of the verb + leadership with a qualifier: "sort of tried to do more leadership", "generally take", "to take some", "taking some". In the later passage, oo5 returns to the theme with "we all did take a little bit of leadership". I see this attention to making a distinction between "being a leader" and "taking leadership", as it is expanded upon throughout the interview, as explicitly **positioning against** "another" kind of leadership, as referred to below.

---

[286] Taken from later in the transcript.

5. In regard to the diagram: I had approached the collective the month before the interview, making a presentation at their monthly meeting and asking if I could interview them as a group. They agreed, and at that time "oo2" had sketched a diagram of how they structured themselves - this is the sketch of the oval to which she refers here. The group made clear that they had put a great deal of thought and discussion into their structure and process, and that the principles guiding the organization of the collective were taken from feminist theoretical writings.
6. The idea of "generally" taking leadership seemed well-agreed upon by the collective; "taking leadership" seemed almost to be equivalent to "taking initiative". What kept this shared leadership from becoming chaotic seemed to be the separation of areas of interest/initiative.
7. "oo2" in particular seemed to make a special effort to deny any subordination of the staff to the steering committee ("CRITICAL organizers," "in essence leaders.") The staff members seemed to take for granted that they would be included as equals, but spoke in a later passage about having had to come gradually to believe that they had a right to equal status in the organization. However, it should be noted that the Theme here introduces the staff as leaders in a specifically qualified way; a second qualification follows the term "leader": "IN ESSENCE leaders ON SOME LEVEL."
8. It was striking that the very phrase "giving orders" made everyone laugh, so far removed was the idea of "giving orders" from their conception of organizing. This seems the stereotype of non-collective, non-collaborative leadership the group **positions against**.
9. Some blurring of terms occurs between the speakers when it comes to defining their organization - "oo2" uses "cooperation" and "collective leadership model" while the next speaker corrects her usage, making a distinction between cooperative or collective, and "collaboration."
10. The notion of "trusting and respecting" is defined as "letting people make mistakes," as allowing things not to be perfect, as not "rushing in". In this part of the passage, the speaker exaggerates the emphasis on "I" as she acts out "**I** could do that better, or **I**...". "Disrespectful" is illustrated, and **positioned against**, as voicing an opinion ("what you thought") in such a way that it acts as a "push or a shove". "Options" and initiative ("can you take it and run?") made this a "collective leadership model that WORKED." Here the speaker **positions against** collective

leadership models that DO NOT work; this is also mentioned throughout the interview, both in terms of the group's past, less successful, experiences, and in terms of other groups in which various people had worked or attempted to work.
11. Noted here and in the first few lines of the next speaker is the use of a rising intonation, adding a note of tentativeness to the words "disrespectful?", "collective?" and "collaboration"? This is the sort of use I tend to think of as geographically and even occupationally associated (although it may still, in these cases, be a feminine phenomenon). It is interesting that the usages here occurred in approximation to each other; although this could be coincidental, there are almost countless instances in which speakers show a marked tendency to approximate each other in language, to accommodate each other's styles[287].
12. Another interesting pattern, again possibly attributable to coincidence, is in the usage of "I" in the beginning of "oo3"'s account: she uses "I" 5 times in her first clause complex, in contrast to the previous speaker who, aside from a role-play quotation ("**I** could do that better"), doesn't use "I" five times in her entire lengthy passage of talk. The previous speaker is one of the speakers mentioned earlier who tends to dominate the discussion; she has just completed the first response to my questioning, and has used "we" more than "I". It was my impression at the time that "oo3" created this contrast to reclaim not only the floor, but the right to speak for herself; she does this by following the previous speaker's emphasis on "we" with her own "I" as Actor and Subject.
13. "oo3" takes the role here and elsewhere of paying close attention to terms used, especially feminist theoretical terms. She makes a distinction here between "collaboration and collective" processes. While the distinction is not verbalized entirely clearly (there seems to be some equivocation between collaborative/ cooperative and collaborative/ collective), she illustrates the notion of collaboration in terms of "equal access to participate" in decisions and "skills and talents" going "on the table at the appropriate time". Process decisions are seen to be embodied in the "structure" and "job description" of the

---

[287] This is demonstrated in the tendency to 'pick up' an accent over time. Physiological studies have even shown that the tongues of listeners tend at times to move in concert with, and in "shadow" approximation of, the words of the speaker.

group and in "lines of accountability and responsibility". Again, language use is what is highlighted: "the word "collaborative" was used quite carefully in that process."
14. "oo3" also places heavy emphasis on the role of the staff as "key people"; this theme was elaborated in the first phase of the analysis.
15. "oo4" expands on the concept of collaboration by specifying that not trying "for consensus with every decision" made the process more successful this year than in past years. As above, I think that the prime distinction being made is between collective decision making, which requires consensus, and collaborative decision making, in which consensus is sought, but is not required. The **positioning against** function thus locates the group style as certainly not "giving orders" - this is laughable, but as more specifically collaborative, as opposed (here and below) to collective/relying on consensus.
16. The need to allow each other to "take responsibility for certain things" occurs because the women on the steering committee tend to be "strong women" who are "used to leading or running something" and who have "lots of vested interests". Trying for consensus with a group of such strong and independent women resulted in "all sorts of power struggles". This is all presented because "there's" strong women; "we had" strong women; "people who are" - note that "I" does not appear as Actor, Subject or Theme in this passage, with the exception of the modal, Thematic qualifier "I think".
17. It is perhaps an example of the tendency, noted earlier, to "match" aspects of utterances, [288]that the first 3 speakers all refer to the metaphor of "the table": "people threw onto the table" ("oo2"); "skills and talents went on the table" ("oo3"); "coming to the table", "voices are quite loud around the table" ("oo4").
18. At the ideational level, "collaboration is a perfect word" for the group process. This process allows the group to forgo consensus and to "accommodate people who are - consider themselves to be leaders."
19. As in the avoidance of "I" in item 16 above, the verbal process "oo4" goes through in the above sentence seems to follow from a desire to distance herself from the word "leader". She seems to start to say "people who are -

---

[288] In this case, the "matching" occurs on a textual, rather than a tonal, level, stressing texture (cohesion) as a linguistic analogue of agreement.

[leaders]" and changes this first to "[who] - CONSIDER themselves leaders", and then goes on to offer an alternative "or [who] CONSIDER themselves to have very loud voices." Note that the use of ellipsis (square brackets) enables the speaker to make Thematic the verb "consider themselves"; this again avoids "being" a leader.

20. Later in the conversation "oo5" returns to "the word 'leader'", explicitly associating the word with "lots of hierarchy and patriarchy things." This explicit association of hierarchy and leadership occurs elsewhere:

> *kk: leadership tends to imply a hierarchical model*
>
> *ii: I think that leadership generally sets up an hierarchial structure in the community*

As does the association with patriarchy

> *ii: I don't think that coming in and taking on the old hierarchical, male-dominated way of managing works.*
>
> *dd: a lot of it for me IS the actual language. There's a language that is understood by business. It is basically, I think, well, certainly, capitalist.. certainly patriarchal. It's just intrinsic.*

As above, "leadership" is seen as a more acceptable term than "leader," which concept is **positioned against**. It seems more an act than a state of being ("taking" leadership, rather than "being a leader").

21. "oo4" connects, although in an implicit, unexplained way, "the whole issue of power" and avoiding "using 'leader' as a word, ever." In mentioning "power conflicts" this speaker seems to refer back to her earlier comment (included in the previous excerpt) that the "power struggles" of earlier years were overcome by allowing these "strong women" with "loud voices" to "take responsibility for certain things without having to come to consensus with everything". This strikes me as reminiscent of a comment made by another strong woman with a strong voice:

> *mm: so it's awkward to one day wake up and recognize that other people perceive you as an individual with a tremendous amount of power. And I think there's a lot of confusion between leadership and power. I don't think that leadership is power. I think that personal power is something that we all have*

22. No one followed up on "oo1"'s comment "'Cause it requires that everyone else is followers, I suppose" although most heads were nodded in agreement. I didn't follow it up, because the comment was taken so completely for granted at the time; it seemed an obvious point in the context of the discussion. Now, looking back at the transcript, I wish I had pressed them on this point. It was similar in feeling to people laughing at the notion of "somebody being a leader in the sense of giving orders": this illustrates for me the level (taken for granted) at which this **positioning** takes place.

23. In terms of the structure of the discussion, it is noticeable in these excerpts that in the earliest stages of the discussion, "exit markers" are used more heavily - perhaps as the group interpersonally negotiates the process of a group interview. In the first three excerpts, the exit markers offer the message "OK, I'm done, someone else can take the floor": "oo2" gives dramatic emphasis to her last two words; "oo3" made an ironic comment and laughed; "oo4" summed up, in a recapitulation of her starting point, "so, it worked well." As the discussion progressed - successfully - these markers became less obvious, and the more subtle mechanisms of turn-taking in everyday conversation gradually took over: in the last two turns, repetition of the point and voice intonation is enough to signal to the group that a turn was available. In these excerpts it is possible to see as well the disappearance of the initial use of qualifiers in first position at a change of speakers: everyone started initially with "I think" "I feel" "I guess", until the strangeness of speaking in a group/ speaking for oneself lessened.

11: Well, naturally the answer to that is yes.
I'm the founding producer of this festival.
And we have [x number of] volunteers,
that are on board for our '93 festival,
I'm the only person that's here all year round.
I bring on a seasonal staff, for part of the year,
but, absolutely I guess that
the answer to that would be yes.

1. Utterance: From my initial to my second question. She answered the next question so briefly, it was a bit rude; to the question which followed that, she didn't respond! A

clear example of a difficult rapport between interviewer and interviewee, which doesn't come across as strongly in print as it did on tape, and on tape not as forcefully as in person. But, once she began to relate aspects of the festival and of her experience which interested/moved her (and knew that I was interested as well?), she became open and enthusiastic. This enthusiasm is attested to by the increased length of her responses and by her increased interest in my comments. (By the end of the interview we come across as friends: she insists that I try and make it to the festival and offers me free passes. In fact, she is so welcoming that I do decide to go, I bring a child and I don't even bother with the passes.) This serves as a good example of how the relation between interviewer and interviewee can change over the course of the interview. This was a phone interview that lasted only 20 minutes; the change in tenor in that short time was remarkable.

2. The speaker "naturally" considers herself a leader, because she is not only the producer of the festival, she is the founding producer and, in addition, she is the only year-round paid staff person. Here, "naturally" seems to correspond in meaning to "obviously": she is at this point responding in a rather unfriendly vein and the connotation of her reply is "what a silly question."

3. The dénouement of her response introduces an unexpected element of equivocation: "absolutely I guess" that her answer to the question 'do you consider yourself a leader' "would be yes". This qualification is intensified when one considers the relative prominence of "I" as Subject and Actor in this short response; then the speaker shifts from "I" to "the answer to that would be". Is she deciding, over the duration of her response, that the question is not perhaps as obvious as she initially assumed?

4. Later in the conversation, this speaker brought out an unusual metaphor for leading/administration which seemed to tie into her confidence and, at the same time, her slight equivocation around being "the leader". I was questioning her career move from artist to administrator of a large festival, and asked whether this was something she "just never questioned" that she'd be able to do. She responded, simply, "Yes." But then went on in a moment to expand:

> *ll: Yes. [...] The answer is yes, I thought I could do it. Probably you get a lot of no's and the people surprise themselves, but it didn't [surprise me]. It's not something that I was terrified of, although, certainly we've had our moments. I'm pretty confident. [mentions her artistic background] So that's my background. But I've been an administrator and probably the thing I'm best at is casting. (laugh).*

In contrasting her response with the probable responses of the other festival directors I talked to, she **positions** herself **against** the majority. As in the case where "ff" positions himself against the population of festival directors, in the contrast created by this speaker the other festival directors are imagined as non-traditional leaders: "ff", who described himself as "coming from" an engineering background, stated that a festival must be run like a business. Here, "ll" states that "probably" "a lot of" the other directors initially questioned their ability to administer a large organization.

hh: Yeah, definitely so, I do.
Every day I walk in here,
I feel like I'm the leader
and that I have to exhibit leadership qualities,
I have to convey a sense of warmth
and caring for everybody in here.
I have to show strength and severity
when necessary,
and I have to show the opposite traits,
when necessary
and I also have to be careful
that I don't let a lot of my emotions just fly,
at random, around the office,
because in the [pre-festival] period,
in the last, say, three months before the festival,
there could be up to twenty people working
in this kind of an environment
or actually in a very open space,
where we don't have a lot of privacy,
so we do overhear each other.
There's a lot of bonding of people,
it's a very sociable type of atmosphere.
So you have to be very careful

that you are always putting out the right impression
for people.
In other words,
if I'm very concerned about something
I wouldn't necessarily come in
looking very nervous
'cause it would just spread to everybody,
So that's one kind of thing
you have to watch
if you're showing leadership qualities,
you always have to keep a lot of your,
not a lot, but many of your inner emotions
a bit tucked away,
so that you don't affect other people's work.
My feelings on leadership has always been
to find the motivation
that allows people to do their best for you,
that's the principle
that I've always worked on.
I give people a lot of freedom.
I don't interfere with
what they're doing too often.
I keep track of it in my own way.
Many times they may not even be aware
of how I'm keeping track of it,
and I usually step in
if I see them going off course,
or if I haven't had communications
with them in a while.
I always like communications with people,
just keep me updated,
what's going on.
If they have a very specific problem
they will come to me
and I will try to help them
solve that problem.
But in general I try to choose people
who are self-starters,
who have very strong self-initiatives,
I know they can really work
without a lot of direction.
I like those kind of people to work with.
I like working around professionals as much as possible,
because I always feel more comfortable around
professionals.
Being a leader, sort of, for your crew means

being able to show
that you care about them, too,
that they mean something to the organization,
that everybody's input is important
and that means taking some individual time with people.
It means having a coffee with them,
or a meal with them once in a while,
and listening to them,
finding out a little bit about their personal lives.
It means, just taking time out to go over a problem
that they're having with them,
you have to do that for the person
who's the highest on the pecking order
and the one on the lowest on the pecking order.
And, many times people have a tendency to get top heavy
and only be concerned
with their two or three lieutenants around them,
but I've always felt that
you have to go find the person who feels
that they're at the lowest end of things
and spend some time with them,
to give everybody a sense of integration
into what's going on.
I've always been a strong believer in
having get-togethers,
for instance we'll have a breakfast,
the whole staff will have a breakfast together,
near the event,
we'll go, every now and then,
we'll have a staff meeting,
and we'll buy everybody a lunch
or something like that.
We'll do some kind of group social thing together
and it loosens up the tension
and makes it feel like
we're having fun together,
not just working so hard.
We try to keep the atmosphere in here FESTIVE,
because I feel
if WE'RE not having fun,
our PRODUCT won't be any fun.
And, we're in the business of entertaining people,
so, that makes it doubly important to
have a very loose kind of festive atmosphere
while you're working.
I stress a lot of harmony.

on the staff, you know?
I try to not bring any people in
who are objective to,
who have, sort of, strong,
offensive kind of personalities.
I don't care how talented they are.
I try to,
when I'm piecing together a staff,
it's like filling a puzzle,
it's like finding a person that kind of,
"yeah, that plugs that in right,
they'll connect well with that person
and that person."
I would sometimes rather hire somebody
whose skills were less,
but I feel would fit in better, you know,
on a personality level.
I'm always working for
that harmony of the staff, you know,
and I've avoided hiring people
with very strong objectional, kind of personalities
and *we've built up a very, very strong,*
very happy, kind of a crew here
and *it's showed in what we've done*
and *it's made my life a lot easier.*

1. Utterance: From my first to my second question.
2. This speaker intensifies his response in several ways: he repeats an affirmative three times ("Yeah", "definitely so", "I do") and he begins the next clause with an intensification of usuality in Thematic position ("Every day") and a concrete, active verb, stressing when and how often he considers himself a leader ("EVERY DAY I walk in here, I feel like I'm the leader").
3. The contrast between the opening comments of this speaker and those of the collective are striking in that, first, the label "leader", rejected among the collective, is embraced here, and, second, the use of "I" here, in the first three clauses, is equivalent to that used by any one speaker in the whole of her utterance in the case of the collective. Here, it is also striking that the speaker chooses a verb in the obligatory mode ("I have to"). This too differs from the perspective given by the collective, that leadership, quite apart from obligation, is taking initiative; the mode chosen here seems, in contrast, somewhat paternal. (Although, even without the contrast - I

interviewed this speaker before I talked to the collective - these comments seemed paternal to me.)

4. He lists several "leadership qualities" which he feels he must exhibit: "a sense of warmth and caring", the ability "to show strength and severity when necessary", not letting emotions "just fly, at random", "finding the motivation that allows people to do their best for you", being able to show that he cares about his crew and that their input is important. This collection of qualities seems to attempt a balance between allowing emotion/ controlling emotion, but a vaguely paternalistic sense of obligation remains. It must perhaps be noted here that many of the female speakers referred explicitly to "nurturing" styles enmeshed with their leadership styles as well.

5. The "leadership quality" of keeping "your inner emotions a bit tucked away, so that you don't affect other people's work" receives prolonged attention. In his series of qualities, it is this one which occasions a shift in Theme - to illustrate why this is an important quality: the speaker changes from "I" to "we" to illustrate the importance of controlling emotion in the context of an open workspace where "we don't have a lot of privacy," where "we" "overhear each other, and are bonded in a "very sociable type of atmosphere." He shifts Theme again to "you", deriving from his illustration ("So") the general rule that "you have to be very careful..." This illustrative move is repeated a second time ("In other words"), with a hypothetical example ("If I'm very concerned...) which again, with a shift in Theme, is seen to produce a general rule ("you always have to keep...many of your inner emotions tucked away"). This rule is offered with the modal qualifier "always".

6. The phrase "finding the motivation that allows people to do their best for you" seems to balance an emphasis on the speaker's role (he must find the motivation; employees do their best for him) with an acknowledgment of the capacity of the employee (lack of motivation is the only potential obstacle to performance, and that is the responsibility of the speaker/leader). Does this "responsibility" form a paternalistic theme? This "principle" is bracketed by, again, the modal adjunct "always".[289]

---

[289] Halliday makes the interesting point that "even a high value modal ('certainly', 'always) is less determinate than a polar form: *that's certainly John* is less certain than

7. How the speaker manages this motivation hurdle is the subject of the next set of illustrations. He accomplishes this through giving "a lot of freedom"; through not interfering; by keeping track of what employees are doing, even if "many times they may not even be aware of how" he's keeping track; by keeping in communication, and by stepping in if he sees "them going off course." In this series of clauses, "I" is the predominant Theme, as well as Actor and Subject.
8. "People who are self-starters, who have strong self-initiatives", and who "can work without a lot of direction" are preferred, as are professionals (defined later as "people who have had some experience... rather than trying to save money and go for the person who doesn't know anything"). But "fit" with other employees is also posited as being very important - that it is addressed in last place in the passage emphasizes this (see below). Here, although the discussion revolves around the employee, the employee is presented as object of the verb or as subordinate (Subject of an embedded clause) to the speaker, and "I" is still the prevailing Theme, Actor and Subject.
9. In a qualified way ("sort of") being a leader is associated with ("means") "being able to show that you care about" your staff and "that everybody's input is important." This forms the third aspect of leadership to receive attention and is illustrated as "taking some individual time with people", and has the result of providing "everybody a sense of integration". The speaker **positions** this **against** the tendency on the part of "people" to get top heavy and only be concerned with the "two or three lieutenants around them". In this series of precepts, Theme and Subject are more varied than in any other section. (I feel obligated to add that each time I read the references to "lieutenants", I am reminded of my reaction when I first heard it, during the interview, because it struck me so strongly that this was true. It struck me not only because of my experience with the festivals I knew best - of which it was an exact description - but also from my experience in the military, where it was all too literally true. I felt this strongly enough at the time that, at this point in the interview, I started to warm up to this speaker.)

---

that's John; it always rains in summer is less invariable than *it rains in summer.*"

10. The topic of "get-togethers" is closely related to the previous discussion of "caring/integration", as it is to the topic of "staff harmony" which follows. Here, the Theme and Subject is primarily "we" and the verbs, following the modal adjunct "always" with which this sub-passage begins, are predominately modal operators of a medium degree of usuality ("will").
11. The speaker places the greatest emphasis in this passage on the notion of being "FESTIVE": "if WE'RE not having fun, our PRODUCT won't be any fun." The coincidence of the verb "to feel" is interesting in this section: "get-togethers" make it <u>feel</u> like the group is having fun together, which is not the same as saying "at get-togethers the group <u>is</u> having fun together." In the next clause "we try" to keep things festive because the leader feels ("I feel") that the product will reflect the atmosphere. The approach here to festivity among the work group is presented grammatically in an instrumental fashion.
12. This speaker, as does others, defines running a festival with being "in the business of entertaining people."
13. The importance of the "fit" of staff members with each other is expanded upon at length at the end of the passage. Looking for or determining this fit is seen as the responsibility of the leader ("when I'm piecing together a staff..."), as is reflected again in the use of "I" for the majority of Themes and Subjects. "Harmony" (mentioned twice) is seen as taking priority over skill level and is contrasted to "strong, offensive kind of personalities" (also mentioned twice). Harmony is defined as fitting like a puzzle piece and connecting well with others - again, seen as the achievement of the leader. This achievement is demonstrated in the festival as product ("it's showed in what we've done") and has benefits for the leader ("it's made my life a lot easier.") Amid these accomplishments of the leader, the attribution of the result in the summing-up ("and...and...and...") of the passage to "we" ("and we've built up") is interesting.

dd: I do think of myself as a leader
and I don't think I approach it from a very <u>traditional</u> point of view.
<u>I never thought of myself as</u>
<u>not coming from a traditional background</u>
but <u>certainly, I suppose</u>, <u>in terms of business leadership</u>

I don't come from a traditional background.
I come from an arts background,
and I come from a PHILOSOPHY that says
if you give people the opportunity,
they will behave up to your expectations.
Negatively or positively, I'm sure,
I mean that works just like parenting,
you just set expectations and -
whether you realize it or not
you set expectations
and whether you realize it or not,
the people who are following your leadership
live up to those expectations.
So, I run the festival that,
is based on empowerment of the individual.
That's its fundamental tenet,
and it so closely parallels
how I feel about leading,
about directing whatever project
I am in charge of.
So far, the festival's been a great fit for me
because I approach my staff that way,
We've got [x number of] volunteers,
and they're just like staff,
only you have less leverage
'cause you're not paying them.
But they're not quite like staff
because they haven't chosen this as a career,
so you have to figure out
what their commitment to the event is.
It's not your career choice,
so you're putting something back into the community,
and to understand those motivating factors,
and respond to those needs -
those are your best ambassadors,
in terms of what I do,
and the best thing I can do as a leader,
is as indefinable as setting a tone.
You can't touch every person
when there's an event as big as this.
You can't touch every person,
with your own little three or four words of
"this is about empowerment."
I mean,
there's no way
you can (laughs) articulate that effectively!

And, the ripple effect has to work both ways,
and I believe it does
if you set a tone with people, that says,
"This, 'A',
this is what the festival's about,
it's this simple,
it's this clear,
this is what we're after,"
and then you act accordingly
the big part is
to practice what you preach,
so that when you have a problem,
an issue, a conflict, whatever,
that comes your way,
and it's always going to be a crisis
that defines what your event is
'cause you have to pare away
what it isn't
in order to discover what to keep.
Then you have that foundation that says,
"Well, our festival is about accessibility,
our festival's about empowerment,
it's about education,
how can we best serve the event?"
And when you approach each decision
that comes your way with those tenets in mind -
an you do that by bringing the people in
who are going to be affected by that decision
and saying,
"Okay, we've got this difficult choice ahead of us
and if we do it this way,
it affects you this way,
and that affects our crowds this way,
or that affects our artists this way,
or whatever.
If we do it this way, blah, blah, blah."
And you take the input.
You don't deny the fact
that ultimately the decision rests with the leader,
but with effective input,
not only can you make a better decision,
but you've also just gained three ambassadors
who'll be able to effectively articulate
why you had to make that decision.
And hopefully -
I swear nine times out of ten -

you can give back an answer
that isn't a "no,"
you just say, "Why not THIS,
because that way it fits?"
So you come back with an alternative
instead of just saying "no,"
'cause there are ideas that come our way,
and my job's to say "yes" to ideas,
but sometimes it's absolutely impossible to do that
whether it so blatantly doesn't fit
what the festival's about
or whether it's finances.
If I can, in the decision-making process,
come up with alternatives that DO fit,
then I can approach it
in at least a "yes, but" situation,
because a blatant "no" without an explanation
is the worst demoralizer you can give.
It's not undisciplined,
but it does allow people the freedom
and the creativity to think that their ideas -
and it's TRUE -
that their ideas can have impact on the event.
And that's what this organization is about.
It's about putting power back into the hands of the creators.
So, I take that and try to apply it
to whatever decision comes our way.
So, it's a case of empowering your managers,
it means you have to orient them really firmly in
what the event is about
before they move.
We had, this year, a new person on staff,
a volunteer coordinator,
it was her first year,
and we had a LOT of pre-meeting discussions
'cause sometimes even her questions
that she was posing to the team leaders
[we'd] go,
"Well, where does that come from?"
because that's jarring to us,
we've been here a long time,
so we're trying already before the meeting even starts
to present it in a way
that isn't conflicting
with the basic tenets of the festival,

because she's asking questions
that imply a closed office for volunteers
or something,
then it's antithetical to what the festival's about,
I KNOW that
when she brings it up in the meeting,
we're gonna get the hackles up,
and all these volunteer team leaders,
who know more than she does at this point
about the event
because they've been there for five years,
no they haven't been paid.
but, regardless.
So, yeah, you set a tone, of openness,
but of a directed openness,
so that you're always CHANNELING people
to think of new ideas
but then, to use the system
in order to incorporate them.

1. Utterance: This speaker wanted to talk for a while before I turned on the tape recorder. After several minutes I asked if I could turn the tape on, repeating the question, "Do you think of yourself as a leader". This extremely long passage is not quite half of the speaker's first utterance. For the sake of manageability, I cut it off where the speaker paused for the first time - not long enough for me to interject, but momentarily, saying to herself "Where am I going with this?" That this is a very long first utterance in comparison with the majority of the others may have been caused in part by the environment in which the interview took place: an extremely noisy café. The noise level made it impossible to hear most of my "backchanneling" responses ("um-hm", "oh?", "right") on tape. For the speaker, this reduction of audible backchanneling from the listener may have had the effect of changing what is usually closer to a dialogue to much more of a monologue.
2. In responding affirmatively, the speaker immediately refers to her non-traditional approach, **positioning** herself immediately (but AFTER the affirmative) **against** a "traditional" leader. If I had it all to do over again, I would love to ask speakers to describe what they think of as traditional (or as any of the other qualities they positioned against).

In the second sentence ("I never thought of myself") the speaker is replying to something I said off tape: she had been talking about her relationship with members of the

local business community and I mentioned that her artist's background was non-traditional for a businessperson. The speaker's reference to not coming from a traditional background seems clearly to reflect my statement of context.

3. It occurred to me at this point in the analysis that some speakers accepted non-problematically that I wanted to talk to them about leadership, while others reacted as if this were irrelevant: "Leadership? What about it?" I wish, belatedly, that I had recorded in my field notes who needed convincing that this was an interesting or relevant question.

4. The speaker contrasts a non-traditional point of view with a non-traditional background. "I never thought of myself as not coming from" is linked to "in terms of business leadership, I don't come from" by an equivocal, slightly contradictory link "but certainly, I suppose".

5. "I come from", as seen above in the discussion of the comments of "qq" and "ii", can be interpreted as the speaker's **positioning against** both what she sees as a traditional background and a traditional point of view. Here, the speaker locates her arts background and her "PHILOSOPHY" (that people will behave to expectations) as non-traditional. The emphasis given "philosophy" makes clear which is the relevant contrast: the rest of the utterance is based on her philosophy.

6. The metaphor of parenting, introduced early in the conversation, seemed striking to me, because I did not identify this woman as a parent - it is still my impression that she is not a parent. The metaphor, constructed with the impersonal "you" stressing rule-like objectivity, is completed, however, not with the illustration of parent/child expectations, but with those of leader/ follower. The parallel structure of this sentence constitutes a rhetorical strategy which adds to the truth value of her claim, insisting that this is true whether or not an individual is aware of the dynamics involved: "whether you realize it or not you set expectations and whether you realize it or not... people... live up to those expectations". Note that this speaker does not seem to have a problem with "leader" implying "follower", as did members of the collective.

7. Unlike "ii" , for example, this speaker does not see a fundamental conflict between one person leading and the notion of empowerment. This seems evident in the rapprochement of "empowerment of the individual" and: "<u>I run</u> the festival"; "people who are following your leadership"; and the equivalence of "leading/ directing/ being in charge

of." Her reconciliation of empowerment and leading is made clear below when she discusses gathering input for a decision without denying "the fact that ultimately the decision rests with the leader". The term "empowerment" occurs throughout the interview, most often as "a fundamental tenet" of the festival. This is underscored in her use of the definite article when she says, "I run the festival that is based on empowerment".

8. The speaker interjects a contrast and comparison of volunteers and staff in the description of her approach to leadership. The contrast itself is interesting from the perspective of the applicability of this research within a more general business framework; the emphasis on "leverage" other than pay, on "motivating factors" and "needs", is certainly of general concern, and the "commitment" she posits, that of "putting something back into the community", is provocative[290]. The construction she uses to extend, in a problematized way, the term "staff" to volunteers, is interesting as well: "they are just like staff, only... But they're not quite like staff because" leaves implicit how it is that they are like staff, and focuses on the differences.

9. The concept of "ambassadors" is one to which the speaker returns more than once during the course of the interview. It was not initially clear to me that the following 50 lines, until her next mention of "ambassadors", is devoted to illustrating this concept (50 lines later, she concludes: "with effective input not only can you make a better decision, but you've also just gained three ambassadors who'll be able to effectively articulate why you had to make that decision".) One reason that this is not clear is that although "ambassadors" is introduced in final position in a clause[291], the speaker rushes on to the next phrase without giving tonal emphasis to the end of the clause. Thus, in the transcription, the clause does not end

---

[290] Rather than change this statement, I decided to leave the presentation just as I found it upon re-reading this passage, drafted months ago. Why do I assume, still, that only those comments which appear in a format familiar to the mainstream discourse ("leverage", "motivating factors", "needs") will have general applicability? Did you notice this?

[291] This is the normal position for information being introduced, the "new" as opposed to the "given" (Halliday, 1985:274-280).

with a period, but is separated from the next group of words by a comma.

In addition, the clause in which the term is introduced has been interjected into the previous, unfinished, clause; finally, the word "ambassadors" is not repeated. The hearer, occupied with following an ongoing stream of words has been insufficiently signaled as to the introduction of an important point. The point which receives emphasis is the next clause "the best thing I can do as a leader is as indefinable as setting a tone." "Setting a tone" is established as prior to gaining "ambassadors", the explanation for which is foreshadowed here.

10. As the above example illustrates, this speaker's utterance is both lengthy and complex; it is not, however, random or irrational. A comparison to the comments of "ee", above, serve to illustrate one result of close linguistic analysis. His office was completely quiet, his manner of speaking was calm and reassuring; that there was extensive ambiguity in his response, as to whether or not he thought of himself as a leader, was not evident to me in the interview. In contrast, this interview took place in an unbearably noisy cafe, chosen for the interview by the interviewee[292]. Her manner of speaking seemed random and incoherent, and I left the interview physically tired, feeling somewhat motion sick! In transcription, however, such "objective" descriptors as "incoherent" and "rambling" versus "rational" and "articulate" or "precise" become problematic: who is more "rational"? The man who presented calmly and well without saying much, or the woman whose style of presentation was more chaotic but who constructed detailed, complex and ultimately quite compelling arguments? How much of my impression of incoherence and my reaction of feeling tired was due to the fact that the conversation, hampered by the ambient noise level, was much more a monologue than a dialogue, leaving me only a passive role?

11. The theme of "setting a tone" is carried through the rest of the passage transcribed here; in fact, it is the return to this theme at the end of the selection, in the form of a coda, or "summing up" move, which marks this passage as a narrative unit. Setting a tone, which is "indefinable" is contrasted to the concrete, and ironic,

---

[292] I wondered, as soon as we arrived in the cafe, why the interviewee had chosen such a terribly noisy spot. It seemed to me that she just didn't notice the commotion, which I found obnoxious.

"touch every person with your own three or four little words"

12. The use of a **marked rhetorical style** seems gradually to become insinuated, through the buildup of repeated phrases ("whether you realize it or not" x2; "they're just like staff...but they're not quite like staff"; "you can't touch every person" x2); this becomes emphatic in the illustration of setting a tone, beginning with "it's this simple". In the following comments, the use of simple, short clauses ("it's this clear, /this is what we're after") reflects the simplicity and clarity of tone that the speaker hopes to achieve ("the best thing I can do as a leader").

13.

> *"and it's always going to be a crisis*
> *that defines what your event is*
> *'cause you have to pare away*
> *what it isn't*
> *in order to discover what to keep."*

This comment seems to me to illustrate, first, the value of breaking the transcript into text units based on the clause. Transcription of spoken communication can overrepresent the complexity of spoken language, by omitting the boundaries and relationships between ideas which are made clear in speech through intonation, pauses, gestures, etc. Written as a single sentence, this idea appears unwieldy; in spoken language and, I think, written in the form of 'clause as text unit', it is succinct, expressive, and insightful. And, thus, the second concept illustrated by this comment seems to me to be the usefulness of speaking to artists about "business": theirs is a gift of expression, one which, as this speaker makes clear later in the interview

> And that's why art is so important, period. It can do that.
> It pushes you to look at things from a different perspective.
> It puts you in front of a - whether it's a painting or a piece of
> sculpture or a street performer or a movie, or whatever,
> it DEMANDS of you that you speak in its language for a while.
> ... It pushes you into a different perspective, and when you return,
> especially if it is art, ... it's coming at you at a level of metaphor.
> ... That metaphor says, "Leap into this imagining place,"
> ... And when you come out of that experience, if it's worked,
> even if it's only partially worked, you're not the same individual.

14. The identification of the festival with "accessibility", "empowerment" and "education" is a recurrent theme throughout the rest of the interview and is used to describe not only the festival, but the processes of leadership as well. The importance of these concepts, and the notion that they are equally important, is emphasized in the use of repetition which maintains the structure of the original statement, though each time in a further reduced form: "our festival is about... our festival's about... it's about".

15. "How can we best serve the event?" is here presented as the ideal guideline for action one might hope to instill on the part of the volunteers and staff - this both resonates with and contrasts with "ii"'s notion of "leadership as service". Here the leader must promote service to the tenets of the event; in the perspective elucidated by "ii", leadership itself is seen as service to the community.

16. In this segment of talk, the speaker makes repeated use of a direct-quotation mode. This mode, as it is used here, emphasizes a type of specificity, an exactness ("and here is exactly the sort of thing you say, if you are going to 'practice what you preach', if you're going to 'set the tone' for accessibility, empowerment and education: ..."). The speaker is using a mode of expression which directly portrays the notion of setting a tone and is "acting out" the part of the leader with the use of direct quotation.

17. When the theme of "ambassadors" recurs, it is in balance with the statement that "ultimately the decision rests with the leader". The repetition of "effective/effectively" makes clear the value of this approach to decision making. Making decisions in the light of the tenets of "accessibility", "empowerment" and "education" is valued not only because these are obligations induced by the philosophy of the festival, but because "bringing... people in" yields "effective input", which in turn facilitates a "better decision"; because people who have actively participated in the process can then act as "ambassadors", able to articulate the reasoning behind decisions made; "because a blatant 'no' without an explanation is the worst demoralizer you can give"; and because her "job's to say 'yes' to ideas".

18. The use of direct quotation continues through the discussion of "saying 'no'/saying 'yes'", and is intensified by the use of active language forms and interjections ("- I swear, nine times out of ten - " ; "- and it's TRUE").

19. Empowerment as a tenet of the festival ("putting power back into the hands of the creators") is translated, in terms of staff and volunteers, into "the freedom and the creativity to think that their ideas - and it's TRUE - that their ideas can have impact on the event. "Empowering [the managers]" (policy-making staff and volunteers at the coordinator level) "means you have to orient them really firmly in what the event is about". This latter process of empowerment is illustrated with a lengthy example/narrative (from "We had, this year" to "So, yeah, you set a tone, of openness") about a specific staff member who needed to be firmly oriented in the need to remain accessible to volunteers. The "punch line" of the narrative - the clause in final position - demonstrates that an aspect of the key tenets of the festival (education, empowerment, access) is involved in the valuing of unpaid staff (volunteers) by paid staff.

20. The theme of "setting a tone" is reintroduced and serves as a coda, or summing-up statement ("So, yeah..."). The result of setting "a tone of openness, but of a directed openness" is "that you're always channeling people to think of new ideas but then to use the system in order to incorporate them." I found myself wondering how this would have to be different in the case of a for-profit organization. I think it would be equally desirable in the private as in the not-for-profit and the public sectors, and that "accessibility, empowerment, and education" might be appropriate tenets across these boundaries as well.

kk: The [Festival] is very political
and analytical in nature,
from the international and local perspective.
And so my background having been,
I did an honours degree in history
and I'm a film maker,
and my whole political perspective is more anarchistic.
I believe strongly in the concept that
we are all individually leaders
in our own ability to act
and to control our own destiny.
Therefore, in my JOB
and in the work place HERE at the [organization],
we do not function as leaders per se,
but as facilitators of the process.
We operate HERE at the [organization],

which has many programs besides just the festival,
as a collective
- we have no boss.
Even our board/staff structure is
one of collective cooperation between us,
so our decision making is not a hierarchical process,
it is consensus.
It is designed to build a network
of understanding to where we are going?
So I sort of balk a bit
at the concept of leadership
because leadership tends
to imply a hierarchical model.
So, when it comes to the festival,
I try
and put THOSE philosophical principles into practice.
We coordinate a fairly large festival,
given the minute budget that we have
compared to all the other festivals in the city.
Because we're political in nature,
we do not get funding from the province
or the city.
We get our CORE funding to run the Centre
from the [x agency]
to focus on [x]
And so, that's a very broad scope.
Within that, we put on the festival.
What that means is
I don't have a staff under me,
as the coordinator of the [Festival],
I have a lot of volunteers (laugh).
And, in conjunction with the other staff,
who are all extremely busy people
doing their own programming,
we pull together, for the festival.
I work with the volunteers
to develop their sense of achievement,
their sense of participating in the process.
That's both very exciting and very challenging.
I DO that specifically
by empowering them to take decisions themselves,
within a certain confine of course.
There are nineteen people
who are coordinating specific aspects of the festival,
all volunteers,
and within that, a number of them have formed committees

to take on the various tasks involved.
The publicity committee for instance is twelve people now,
and that's one of the nineteen aspects
of the festival
which the volunteers are coordinating.
So I just sort of attempt
to facilitate the whole process
and keep it rolling.
People come in,
want to find out about the festival,
I will get them interested
in helping out with certain aspects of it,
and ask them
what THEY'RE most interested in doing,
also assessing their own needs
and abilities as well,
they do that,
I do that in conjunction with them.
And then we decide upon
which volunteer aspect of the festival
that they'd be most interested in doing.
We have about a hundred and thirty volunteers
for the festival,
so the coordination of it is a bit of a trick (laugh)
as you can well imagine.

1. Utterance: from my first question to my second.
2. In response to "do you think of yourself as a leader?", the speaker begins, as did "ee", with "The Festival...". By beginning the next clause with "And so" the speaker creates the expectation that what will follow is as a result of the first statement, which logically it is not. However, the assumption that the individual directing the festival would have to in some way "fit" the festival seems appropriate.
3. The speaker moves next to his background, as the next pertinent factor in his thinking or not thinking of himself as a leader. His degree in history, his self identification as a film maker, his "more anarchistic" political perspective are, like the "very political and analytical" nature of the festival, posited in contrast to the unstated norm: the "average" or accepted definition of leader. The very choice of adjective in the phrase "more anarchistic," for example, posits a contrast: more anarchistic than what? Than what you might be asking. This is a clear example of

positioning against what the speaker believes to be a mainstream view.

4. Because "we are all individually leaders in our own ability to act and to control our own destiny", the speaker maintains that "Therefore" in his job he does not function as a leader, but is a facilitator of the process. His comments resonate with those of "ii" (above) who stated that she didn't "believe anyone should be leaders unless we're all leaders"; both he and "ii" refer to trying to "put philosophical principles into practice". His description of leadership seems to contradict somewhat the distinction made by "mm" (below), between personal power and leadership:

> *mm: I don't think that leadership is power.*
> *I think that personal power is something*
> *that we all have*
> *and we all exercise it in order to do*
> *what we need to do, for us*

5. Note change from "I" to "we" as the speaker moves from his background ("I did/I'm a/I believe") to the work place ("we do not function as/ We operate"). Also note that "we do not function as leaders" is qualified, weakened by "per se". This is not the same as "we do not function as leaders" full stop.

6. The parent festival is described as operating as a "collective", which means they "have no boss"; that the "board/staff structure is one of collective cooperation" supports the notion that their "decision making is not a hierarchical process"; their consensus process is "designed to build a network of understanding to where" they are going. These definitions and illustrations of consensus/ cooperative/ collective are congruent with those employed by "ii" and by the other collective. In all three cases, consensus is opposed to hierarchy; in the case of "dd", she emphasizes empowerment and accessibility, but qualifies her style as "not completely consensus, but more consensus, more interactive". In the contrast, it can be seen that "dd" **positions against** both the mainstream and the most prevalent alternative discourses of leadership.

7. "So I sort of balk a bit" and "So, when it comes to the festival" provide a two-part conclusion to the first segment of talk, explaining why he begins his response to "are you a leader?" with "The festival is..." and how he puts these principles into practice. In associating "leadership" with "a hierarchical model", again, the speaker repeats sentiments voiced by "ii" and the collective, and all three

discuss the primacy of philosophy in determining the operation of their respective organizations - is the correspondence between the three connected to the "political nature" of their three festivals? Also note the doubly qualified structure of "So I sort of balk a bit." What seems a slight ambiguity in this speaker's approach to leadership is taken up below.

8. The speaker contrasts this festival with "all the other festivals in the city" on the basis of the political nature of his festival, which results in limited funding.

9. The metaphor of "a staff under me" is hierarchical and is in contrast to his "balking" at the implications of a hierarchical model - does this contradict his claims for collective processes and consensus building?

10. I connect the laughter at "I have a lot of volunteers" with the wry laughter at the end of his utterance, which seemed and seems to me to signify "And you KNOW what that means!" It's "a bit tricky" to work with volunteers. (compare to end).

11. The shifting from "I" to "we" and back here seems to signal a shift in focus from the collective to the role of the individual.

12. In order to develop volunteers' "sense of achievement, their sense of participating in the process", the speaker empowers "them to take decisions themselves, within a certain confine of course." Note the addition not only of the qualifier "within a certain confine", but the intensifier of that qualification, "of course."

13. Examples of the depth and scope of the volunteer festival organization are provided (number of committees/ "aspects"/ functional areas, number of people on one committee) as an illustration of the director's role as a facilitator of "the whole process". Note, however, the qualification of his attempt to facilitate: "just sort of". This seems to function to inject a note of humility, a disparagement of the speaker's role as a facilitator.

14. There seems to me a certain tension implicit, in the speaker's attempt to describe his dealings with new volunteers, between a hierarchical and a non-hierarchical phrasing of the process. "I get them interested" is balanced by "and ask them", (speaker as Actor/Subject, volunteers as Goal/Target) followed by a marked verbal emphasis on "what THEY'RE most interested in"; although here, the Theme is still removed from the volunteer. "Assessing their own needs...they do that" is balanced by "I do that in conjunction with them." During the interview, and subsequently, reading the transcripts, I "heard" this as

the speaker's insistence that power is disbursed, consciously, to the volunteers, but as well his not wanting entirely to give up the status of director. This might be seen as demonstrated by his closing the utterance with an emphasis on the number of volunteers and, thus, the magnitude of his job. I still see that "reading" of his comments, but wonder now how much of it was due to wanting to speak to me in what was perceived to be "my" language, the language of business in which, as he acknowledges, value is measured in a vertical direction, in steps up the hierarchy. The final clause, "as you can well imagine," might be read this way, referring less to my experience with festivals than to my "knowledge" of leadership and management as a student of business.

pp: In some instances, yes.
Although I may not be the one
who is up front,
whose name that you would see
IN TERMS OF publicity material,
but I would consider myself a leader
IN THE FACT OF
bringing up the subject to consciousness of those
that I am working with,
IN TERMS OF remembering
that, you know, [the time of the festival] is here.
Bringing again to their consciousness
what [this time] SHOULD be all about.
If not necessarily
what it is right now,
but what it should be.
I'm very much involved
in sort of the initial brain storming,
and the initial planning,
and the initial strategizing
as to what is, like this [particular festival],
[is] coming to an end.
I'm very much involved
in organizing some of the activities.
And once this is over,
in terms of bringing to the attention,
say for example, in the [organization] board,
of which I am a member,
saying, okay,

this 1993 [festival] is over,
<u>when do we begin planning</u> for 1994?
<u>What are we hoping to achieve</u>?
<u>What will be our goal</u> for 1994?

1. Utterance: from my first to my second question.
2. Her affirmative answer is qualified, not only in its introduction ("In some instances") but in the clause that follows ("Although I may not be..."). This second sentence doubles the qualification of her leadership: "Although I may not be the one (1) who..." and (2) "whose name that you see" (this latter clause makes reference as well to "Although I may not be the one" through ellipsis).
3. This qualification of her leadership is a good example of the speaker **positioning** herself **against** a assumed standard. Her qualifications, referring to "the one who is up front" and the one "whose name that you would see in terms of publicity material", make clear that these would be the obvious "leaders." She states that "although" she is not the obvious, or the typical, leader, she considers herself a leader. It can be noted that the qualifications she makes as to who might be the obvious leader correspond to those centered upon in the Chapter 2 critique "focus on the public, official, visible, dramatic".
4. The speaker considers herself a leader "in the fact of bringing... to consciousness" both the actual festival and the ideal of the festival ("bringing up the subject" and "what it should be". Her involvement spans brainstorming, planning, strategizing, and organizing. The phrases she uses in this categorization of her leadership are repetitive, often Thematic, and centre interestingly on language and memory: "IN TERMS OF" and "*bringing to consciousness.*"
5. A marked **rhetorical style** is noticeable in, first, the repetition the speaker uses throughout the passage (see double underline). "Bringing to consciousness", "should be", "very much involved," "initial" are all repeated ; the utterance ends with three rhetorical questions, each structured in an identical manner. These repetitions were emphasized vocally and with facial and body gestures. A second aspect of the rhetorical style which seems to be in effect here is seen in the prominence of opposition: from "<u>Although</u> I may not be..." to "<u>If not</u> necessarily what it is right now..." which is structured with predominantly negative modality.

This negative modality was prominent in the comments of "aa" above, as was a certain amount of rhetorical style. What distinguished the comments of these two speakers most in my mind, however, was the fact that I felt I understood "aa" very well and that the interview was valuable. In the case of the present speaker, I left the interview feeling that I had not gotten anything of value. I feel, after many iterations through this closer analysis, that this difference was due in the first instance to a difference in rhetorical style. I "read" this style initially, as I did the style of "qq" as moralizing - and thus, not only NOT personally appealing to me but, more importantly, NOT relevant to "Business." This point will be taken up at the end of this chapter and in the conclusions.

mm: Well, I actually do recognize
that I have a role,
and I have a tremendous amount of responsibility,
and I know that I'm a public figure,
and it took (laugh) me quite a few years to recognize
that that's what I'd actually become (laugh).
You can't really believe it
when it actually happens,
because what you're doing seems so small.
No matter what you do,
you're just one person,
it feels like you may be a small part of the larger thing
you're working in,
so it's awkward to one day wake up and recognize
that other people perceive you as an individual with a
tremendous amount of power.
And I think there's a lot of confusion,
between leadership and power.
I don't think that leadership is power.
I think that personal power is something
that we all have
and we all exercise it in order to do
what we need to do, for us,
and that's all I'm doin'.
So when it gets to recognizing the responsibility
I have within this organization,
and within this large public event
that we do,

I take it very seriously
I mean, I'm laughing at myself a great deal.
I have to have a sense of humour about this,
because you can't take what you're doing, and yourself so seriously
that you can't function.
And when you've become recognizable as a public figure,
in a small community like Edmonton
it's easy to do, you see, after so many years,
it doesn't take much to become (laugh) a public figure, you know (laugh)?
Then, then that does something else,
and then, you see, you have to accept it -
I'm proud of it, you know,
I'm proud of what we do in Edmonton,
I'm proud of every one of us
who work on a major public event like this
and who have an interest in maintaining
some type of quality of life, for the community,
which is one motherhood statement,
but more importantly providing opportunity for the artist
that we care about, a lot,
and want to live with,
and want to have them in our lives.
But you know it is a responsibility
that, the result of taking that responsibility
and working with it,
and being there for it,
or in it,
is then, it can affect you personally, obviously,
you have to be in it all the way,
and it can affect your families, your children, the people around you, so.
It's really important to
always look at it in perspective
and to keep the thing balanced,
to not, in my opinion,
not get swept into the public realm to the extent
that you're no longer
who you are.
And that can easily happen
when you're working with a tremendous, sort of,
collective consciousness
that I was talking about earlier.
There's this high level of energy,
and there's lots of pulls to help,

and to be part of as much as you can be.
It's always expanding on itself,
and something that you create from the ground level of the community
and you create a pyramid of strength,
and then you find all of a sudden,
it starts to stack another inverted pyramid on top of it,
because it's expanding,
it's opening up and expanding, and becoming international,
and THEN you look at
where's the real strength,
and what IS that point where those two things are touching,
and what's holding that together,
and I don't think
that any one individual
should ever hold anything like that together, themselves, alone.
I think that's a very WRONG approach,
and I do say right and wrong,
because I've thought about that a great deal.
So I make choices and selections, all the time, to ensure that there's younger people, coming up, [and] coming into this thing,
that there's peers of mine
that are part of this thing,
that it's their thing, also.
And that there are more mature people
that are guiding us and directing us.
And we actually sit down as a group of people
and talk about
who our community is
that's helping get this thing done,
this thing being all these projects we do
and the [festival] being a public focus for it.
[It's] very deliberately sort of cared for,
to make sure
that it doesn't just sort of fall over (laugh).

1. Utterance: This utterance did not take place in the initial part of the conversation, but rather came nearly halfway through the interview. In the first part of the interview the speaker had addressed the question of "the role of artists as leaders"; this topic had comprised a central theme of that year's festival. Thus it was only

later in the conversation that we turned to her perception of her own role. The utterance ends where I pose a further question.

2. She begins with a statement which implies a three-or four-part interpretation of a leader: this includes having a role, having responsibility, and being a public figure. The placement of the "new" information in the clause in final position in the clause is nicely illustrated by this first series of comments.

The Theme, Actor and Subject in the series is almost uniformly "I".

3. The construction she uses, beginning and ending with "recognition", places recognition of her leadership role as a fourth aspect of the leadership role; that one's recognition of one's role is not necessarily immediate is stressed with humor in the first statement, and continues to form a theme in her comments - both here, in reference to herself, and elsewhere in reference to artists-as-leaders.

4. A strong contrast is formed between the first and the second statement. The first accumulates a string of active constructions in the first person: "I actually do recognize; I have; I have; I know." The second compiles a cluster of second-person constructions, with the Subject, already thus generalized, in a subordinate position in several of the clauses: You can't really believe; what you're doing; what you do; you're just; like you may be; [that](through ellipsis) you're working in; people perceive you. The subordination of the subject to "the larger thing you're working in" is intensified by the repetition of negatives and adjectives signaling self-deprecation: "can't; small; no matter; just; small; awkward". This depreciation of the power of the leader forms a theme which is twinned with the contrasting theme of active creation by the leader. This contrast functions on at least two levels: at the level of the message, the role of the leader is inevitably subject to the duality of acting creatively on one's own behalf and at the same time on behalf of the larger community. At the textual level, the tension between personal and public power is unresolved, as seen below.

5. In the third statement, the subject reverts to the personal ("I think, I don't think, I think"). It is the speaker's personal opinion that leadership is not power, because everyone has power. This is emphasized with a shift in Actor/ Subject, and usually Theme again, this time to we: "we all have; we all exercise; what we need; for us". The deprecation of the speaker's role is reintroduced at the end of this string of collective subjects with the use, in the

"newsworthy" final position, of the vernacular form "that's all I'm doin'." This seems to **position** the speaker **against** those who confuse leadership and power.

6. The contrast, almost amounting to contradiction, between taking one's responsibility as a leader seriously and taking oneself and one's work too seriously receives more obvious emphasis in the original transcription:

> *I take it very seriously*
> *and I don't um...*
> *I mean it, it's, I have, like I'm quite,*
> *I'm laughing at myself a great deal.*

"Laughing at oneself" is effectively illustrated when the speaker laughs at herself, again depreciating her power and importance: "it doesn't take much to become a public figure."

7. The speaker's comments here begin to take on a point/counterpoint structure - (large public event)I take it seriously/ you can't take it too seriously (small community)/ I'm proud (major public event).

8. What the speaker is proud of is, in general ("one motherhood statement"), maintaining some quality of life for the community. More specifically, and more importantly, she is concerned with providing an opportunity for the artist. She emphasizes that this is the more important interpretation of the raison d'être of the festival with a repetition of a construction which describes the place of the artist in the community: the artist that we care about, [that we] want to live with, [that we] want to have them in our lives.

9. The inclusion of a significant amount of repetition here signals the use of a definite and dramatic **rhetorical style**: "I'm proud" is repeated three times; followed by the artist "we care about,[we] want, [we] want; then "taking, working with, being there for or in" the responsibility; and finally the affect this can have on "families, children, people around you."

And I have to admit here, again, to a startling inconsistency in my initial appreciation of rhetorical style, which I will pose as a rhetorical question: Why did I read this speaker's style as powerful and other styles as moralizing? I say initial appreciation, because as I experienced the process of analyzing these transcripts, styles became more obvious to me, I developed an appreciation for them, and, finally, I became conscious of

the role played by rhetorical styles in some of my initial impressions.
10. The point/counterpoint theme might be seen to be connected to the concern with "balance" which is mentioned here and which occurs twice again before the end of the utterance, closing the utterance in final position.
11. Being "no longer who you are" is the result of imbalance in the role of a leader, of being too thoroughly or too far "swept into the public realm" by the pull of a collective consciousness (vision), by the high level of energy involved, by the desire to help and to be a part of. The construction "swept into" leads to the question: swept out of where? Coming after "families, children, people around you" the contrast seems to be public/private.
12. The counter to the theme "just a small part of a bigger thing" appears here in "you create, you create."
13. The stacking of an inverted pyramid on top of the first pyramid is a striking image of balance. Opposed to the image of balance is the that of strength: "a pyramid of strength" is strong through balance; the strength needed for "one individual" to "hold together" the precariously balanced pyramids is impossible, is a "wrong approach."
14. "And I do say right and wrong" was said with a defensive intonation. Who is she arguing against, that would not say "right and wrong"? Someone who would defend one individual holding it all together?
15. As a counter to one individual wrongly trying to balance the inverted pyramid of the expanding organization, the speaker actively (making "choices and selections") ensures that younger people, peers, and more mature people "are part of this thing," "that it's their thing also". This theme is very similar to "kk"'s comments about succession and empowerment.
16. The enumeration of the groups which the speaker ensures are a part of the organization leads to the mention of community and the return to the image of balance. The qualification "sort of", used twice, does not appear as a sign of equivocation here, but rather precedes and introduces metaphorical language: "cared for" is metaphorical in application to "this thing... this thing being ...projects ... and the festival"; "fall over" is a metaphorical image, one which projects the theme of balance.

gg: In some senses, yes.
In some sense, yes.
Taking charge, I guess.
Basically, with the experience that I've had,
just guiding people through.
Now, like with organizing [the festival] this year,
I sent out about 50 letters
and I got about 30 respond,
so I'm expecting about 30 people here.
So with the agenda that I have,
I hope we have different ideas -
like we had [the] film festival,
an artist show, a picnic,
[another aspect of the festival],
a person to look after the prizes,
and a business fair,
and I know there's a few other items.
But what I plan on doing is,
instead of [me] doing it all,
to say "OK,
these are ideas -
who wants to work on this,
who wants to work on that."
And then get 2 or 3 people
working on committees,
and have them come back to me
and say, "hey, this is what I've got,
this is what I've done."
And then, in a month's time,
they let me know what's happened,
and then, if things aren't happening,
then I'll give it to somebody else.
Or I'll just basically advise them of where to go,
what to do,
things like that.
Just kinda, overlook
and guide people basically.
I enjoy doing that.
But I'll probably have my hands on certain things,
like the film festival,
because I did it before
and I have the experience,
so I'll do that again, probably,
and help the people.
[Another festival organization] is going to help me with
[it] also,

which is good.
So, I hope to have my hands on that,
and a concert also, with [the concert performers].

1. Utterance: The speaker began by explaining to me what projects he had worked on in the last year and why. This utterance is his response to the question, "Well, do you think of yourself as a leader then?"; it is bounded by the next question I posed.
2. The speaker begins by heavily qualifying his affirmative answer: "in some senses; in some sense; I guess; basically; just".
3. The speaker seems to offer his example of organizing the previous year's festival as an illustration of both "taking charge" ("I sent out, I got") and of "just guiding people" ("I hope we have different ideas/ instead of me doing it all/ who wants to work on this")
4. Referring to the example of organizing last year's festival ("instead of [me] doing it all), the speaker lays out his plan for delegating in a very concrete way: "and then, and then". With the use of direct quotation the speaker "acts out" a concrete example of his plan, playing the part of himself as leader and of the others, reporting back to him.
5. "Taking charge" type behaviour, as part of the concrete plan ("I'll give it to somebody else") is immediately contrasted with ("Or") three, qualified versions of "guiding": "<u>just basically</u> advise, <u>just kinda</u> overlook, guide people <u>basically</u>."
6. By this point in the interview, the statement "I enjoy doing it" had been repeated four times; it will be repeated seven times more by the end of the interview. Also repeated multiple times is "It's fun." He also repeated that he did what he did "for the community" over and over again. This repetition became a "sticking point" in the interview: as I tried to get him to expand on these twin explanations (he said both so often they seemed cryptic themes which needed exploration), the more he repeated the phrases without explaining them. Before the end of the interview, each statement to the effect that 'he does this because he enjoys it and for the community' became slightly more defensive - or perhaps slightly more despairing of my being able to understand? - than the one before. Could this be a case of the speaker **positioning against** leadership not done for enjoyment or for the betterment of the community as in "qq"?

7. "Hands on", "helping" and "being helped" seem to constitute three facets of his role. "Hands on" is contrasted to the role of "guiding/helping" ("But...").

nn: I went the traditional route
WHERE I went to York University
AND got my honours BFA in film,
film and theatre.
AND it was really a useless four years
AND almost immediately,
I graduated in April,
AND by June I had gotten involved in a clown workshop
at the National Arts Centre.
AND in that workshop,
FOR THE FIRST TIME IN MY LIFE,
I was being challenged to identify
who I really was.
Because in clowning, real clowning,
you work with the centre of yourself
and the centre of the individual
or the audience member,
and the way that you manage
to bring them out
(SOMEONE COMES TO THE DOOR)
<TAPE OFF>
So, from the clown workshop,
which was the first time
I was challenged and inspired,
I went into performing.
And then, from that time,
which was '74,
until last year,
I've always combined performance with administration.
And last year was only a turn around
because I took a full contract here with [the
organization]
but it was a limited contract
'cause I never want to give up that side.
But what was interesting is
in CLOWNING you learn
how to identify with the real person,
and bring out the very best of them,
and I think

that to me is leadership.
That the strength of a leader is
in drawing people together,
and finding a way to make them,
HELP them realize their full potential
and I LOVE that.
And I love it so much is why
I love this,
it's why I can cope
with an administrative position.
I absolutely believe
in the sense of team responsibility,
where there isn't a hierarchy,
but that people work off each other.
And in a funny way,
it's interesting,
'cause a lot of the people
that I've brought on,
I'm now working with, I think, about twelve people,
that they're not familiar with this process.
And I was just talking to our publicist
who has always worked on her own,
and she said,
it's such an enlightening experience
to come into this office,
because she always thinks,
"okay, it's my problem,
I've got to solve it,"
and suddenly there's a group of people
that want to solve it with her.
And I think that it's a difficult way to work.
And so it has to be in your mind set
to be willing to
include other people
in your job description.
I get very involved with anyone,
it's just my nature,
and also because as I get to know people
I get to recognize where their strengths are.
And in fact everybody that I work with,
I find that I know their strengths
and I know their weaknesses,
and in knowing their weaknesses I say,
"OK I have to compensate for that person that way,
so that they can build this way
and I'll get somebody else in,

to complement that weakness."
And then what I'm doing is
I'm removing the stress from me,
because I'm acknowledging that.
I'm not emphasizing their weakness,
but I'm clear about it.
And I'm helping them build their strengths
and I think that is
why people continue to work here,
and come back here,
even though pay-wise it's not very good.
So I think probably
that would be how I perceive leadership.

1. Utterance: This speaker announced that she would begin by outlining "a little bit about where I came from". Her description of her background leads into her definition of leadership, although she does not directly address whether or how she considers herself a leader, and I don't pose the question again directly. The utterance is bounded by my next question.
2. The speaker considers the "traditional route" to competence in her field, through a BFA, "useless," but a clown workshop becomes a pivotal experience. The importance of the clown workshop is highlighted through the phrase "for the first time in my life", which is made to precede the clause it modifies, building tension and marking the postponed clause for special attention ("being challenged to identify who I really was". This postponing of the expected, and the creation of emphasis which it causes, is in effect what the speaker is doing with this entire utterance, as she begins with her background in order to build up to talking about leadership: the use of conjunctives (small caps: "AND/AND/AND") renders the first seven clauses mere lead-in to the punch line, "challenged to identify etc.". The emphasis on clowning is signaled with repetition ("clowning, real clowning"; "centre of yourself /centre of the individual").
3. Her statement that what one learns in clowning for her defines leadership struck me at the time of the interview very much as an unexpected punch line. She recommences the utterance after the interruption with a summary statement of her background until the present, and then moves to an emphatic statement of the major point: "So...But what was interesting is...". Note that the emphasis of both the introduction/flag of "What was interesting" and the

intonation given to "CLOWNING" works to focus attention on the imminent conclusion/ punch line.

4. The definition of a leader, derived from clowning, is identifying "with the real person" and bringing out "the very best of them". The speaker reiterates this as "the strength of a leader"; this strength is portrayed with active verbs of material processes: "bring out"; "drawing... together". The active, material process emphasis reaches its strongest expression in "make them" (realize their full potential), but the speaker corrects this with "HELP them realize their full potential. The speaker follows the definition of a leader's strength with "I LOVE that/ I love it/ I love this/ It's why I can cope" ; at this point she does implicitly answer the question, "Do you think of yourself as a leader."

5. This implicit reference to herself as leader, then, is followed by her description of her leadership role or style, introduced with a pledge of conviction ("I absolutely believe"), by the use of more conventionally unconventional terms ("team responsibility, no hierarchy"), and is then developed in anecdotal form. That the anecdote is relevant is signaled again by the flag, "it's interesting."

6. The anecdote which is given here begins with a summary statement: "a lot of the people...[are] not familiar with this process": this is a clear example of **positioning against** the type of leadership most people would be familiar with. What is often not familiar to the people she works with is "the sense of team responsibility where there isn't a hierarchy." The speaker then moves to the specific example, using reported speech (direct quotation).

7. Working in a team setting, "where people work off each other" and where there is " a group of people that want to solve" problems with each other, is described both as "an enlightening experience" and as "a difficult way to work." An expression of "enlightenment" is reflected in the contrast in the time modulation, "she always thinks... and suddenly there's this...". The contrast of "enlightening/difficult" can be read, because of the imprecision of the subject "you", that the experience is enlightening for others, such as the woman who is the subject of the anecdote, but is difficult for the leader, who must "be willing to include other people in" her or his job description.

8. The fact that the speaker knows her coworkers' strengths and weaknesses is not portrayed as a fully volitional process: "as I get to know people, I get to recognize", "I find that I know". This is intensified with

her comment "it's just my nature". Her reaction to this knowledge is, however, completely active: she has "to compensate," and to "get somebody else in"; these actions are portrayed in direct speech, intensifying the immediacy effect of decision made and action taken. These actions that she takes are depicted as beneficial for the subordinate: she compensates "so that they can build", she gets someone else "to complement that weakness."
9. Almost as a counter to this beneficent focus on the subordinate, the speaker turns back to the benefit this attention to strengths and weaknesses brings her, as the leader. "Being clear about" others' weaknesses is less stressful for the leader, while focusing on others' strengths helps "them build their strengths."
10. The speaker closes the utterance by reiterating that this has been her definition of leadership. She has finished by describing in the first person, in concrete terms, her success in fulfilling the general terms she set out in her earlier statement that "the strength of a leader is in drawing people together and finding a way... to help them realize their full potential." She does this in the statement that "people continue to work here and come back here even though pay-wise it's not very good."

One interview has not been excerpted for use in this section: "bb", who is quoted liberally in the first phase of the analysis, began the interview by responding to the question "Do you consider yourself a leader" with an utterance which ran to 52 pages of transcript.

Evaluation of Racial and Gender Inclusiveness

In this section the evaluation of the second phase of the analysis is accomplished by a final check against the questions of the second chapter critique.

The first several questions operationalizing the critique were addressed, and satisfied, by recourse to the research design: the association of women and minority men with leadership was defined in the first chapter as a *neglected area of research*, which neglect the present study was designed to counter. The long-standing omission of the concerns of women and minority men in leadership research

was seen to be caused in part by the historical association of white men with the *public, visible, official and dramatic* roles which are seen as inherent to positions of leadership; the subjects of this research were consciously chosen to comprise a diverse group, countering this association and challenging the *assumption of a single society* in which differences of race and gender are presumed to be irrelevant. The research base was not assumed to be *neutral with respect to race or gender*, but was rather held up to challenge by the critiques of feminist literature and Black feminist epistemology, and by the opinions of interviewees.

The results of the first part of the analysis, however, did appear to be "neutral with respect to race and gender". My experience of the differences which characterized the individuals I interviewed was somehow not reflected in the results I was obtaining through my diligent coding and counting of themes. Sure, some of the directors talked about gender and race, but they talked more about, and more of them talked about, stakeholders, vision, and stages of development. Gradually, and slowly, over a period of several months, I came to question whether this apparent neutrality could be seen as an 'objective' result, or whether in fact 'neutrality' appeared as an artifact of the methodology.

> The analysis of the patriarchal structures of society and the positions that we occupy within them requires a theory which can address forms of social organization and the social meanings and values which guarantee or contest them. Yet it must also be able to theorize individual consciousness. We need a theory of the relation between language, subjectivity, social organization and power.[293]

The first part of the analysis takes the non-problematic view of language assumed by the traditional approach to qualitative data; in the second part of the analysis, the view of language embedded in the methodology is explicitly critical. A naïve view of language is one which, as alluded to in Chapter 5, imagines that language functions as simple representation of reality, ignoring that human reality is constantly mediated, structured and shaped by means of language. A naïve view also ignores that, while language is intimately bound to one's place in the social structure, it

---

[293] Weedon (1987:12)

is not reducible to a simple, hierarchically indexed, reflection of social status.

It is an earlier approach to language which tends, paradoxically, to accept both that a standard language exists and that completely free expression is possible; perhaps equally paradoxically, more recent and more widely accepted language research demonstrates that standard forms are disputed and ever-evolving, while the concept of totally free expression is unrealistic, given the reliance on normative and relatively stable forms of utterance which make up speech genres in any system of communication.

At the micro level, the example was given in the last chapter of the work of Labov, who demonstrated that the grammatical structures commonly employed by Black inner city youth were reflective less of the (in)ability of Black youngsters to grasp the rules of standard English grammar than of their willingness to discard those rules; in place of the grammatical rules of the dominant society these young people employed alternative structures, structures of their own making which reinforced social boundaries in an act of resistance.

At a more macro level, the level of the utterance, Bakhtin's examples of mandatory, generic forms associated with every sphere of social life span the spectrum from the trivial (forms of greeting, stock phrases as "she'll be with you in a moment"), to the sublime (the ironic mixing of historic forms and literary styles as found in the esoteric writings of, for example, Roberto Calasso[294]). In terms of grammatical structures and of structures above the level of the sentence, the myth of one standard language, freely employed, is revealed as untenable: language must be analyzed in its function, rather than its forms, and the work of the individual must be seen not as combining 'neutral' forms, but as choosing, for her or his own purposes, between combinations of forms which are socially determined.

That traditional *methods and research situations are unable to capture certain types of information* is made clear

---

[294] Calasso (1993), *The Marriage of Cadmus and Harmony*. I haven't decided yet whether the use of "sublime" in this sentence is ironic, pending completion of the book - which has been triumphantly received, but which starts with the theme of the abduction of women by male gods. In myth. Perhaps a less qualified example of the sublime would be Laura Esquivel's *Like Water for Chocolate* (1992).

in the second part of the analysis; it is clearly the theory of language underpinning the second part of the analysis which makes it possible to capture additional information. For subjects who lack status and legitimacy, a critical theory of language provides access to expression which is silenced in traditional approaches to qualitative data. Because non-dominant groups must make use of, in Moore's phrasing, the "dominant modes of expression"[295], difference is easily suppressed at the level of simple, untheorized representation.

A word count, for example, of terms employed by the speakers in their comments on leadership, might easily be used to support the "objectivity" of the results of the first phase of the analysis. From the perspective of the theory underlying the second phase of the analysis, however, this would demonstrate little more than the prevalence of an accepted vocabulary of leadership - and in fact would reinforce the definition of discourse upon which the second part of the analysis is based. The theorized approach to language which underlies the second part of the analysis enables the study of alternative functions which the standard forms can be made to accomplish. In fact, the creation of an alternative approach through the manipulation of standard forms is the achievement of the dynamic demonstrated in the theme of "POSITIONING AGAINST".

The question of whether or to what extent *concrete experience is used as a criterion of meaning* was likewise problematic in the first part of the analysis because of the difficulty in interpreting meaning in qualitative data with a theory of language based on simple representation. With no attention given the texture, structure or integrity of the speaker's own account, the most pertinent reflection of experience in the analysis is that of the researcher. In the second phase, primacy is given to the experience of the speaker through an analysis which goes beyond simple representation - the level of meaning most easily abstracted. The levels of interpersonal and textual meaning are articulated most closely with, and are less easily divorced from, the immediate situation of the speaker.

The relative difficulty of communication in the various interviews, the differing degrees to which rapport was established between interviewer and interviewee, the intensity, irony, warmth or animosity of the speakers' expression - for none of these is provision made in the

---

[295] Moore (1988:3)

traditional method employed in the first phase of the analysis. The approach to language embedded in the mainstream approaches to qualitative methodology is not theorized with respect to the evaluation of dialogic processes: the role of the interviewer is imagined, falsely, as one which can aspire to neutrality. Thus the impact on the data of the identity of the interviewer is not measurable, or even detectable, using a traditional methodology.

In this way the *use of dialogue to assess knowledge claims* is actively avoided in the approach taken in the first part of the analysis. Perhaps more damaging to the integrity of the analysis than the fact that certain types of information were not accessible is the problem of the active obfuscation of certain aspects of the data collection and interpretation by traditional methods of analysis: for example, passages of talk deemed confusing, obscure or unsettling from the perspective of the interviewer, can be and no doubt most often *are* omitted from the analysis, non-problematically labeled as "unusable", as contaminated by the personal, as irrelevant to the question. The difficulties of my relations with some of the interviewees, in particular my initial inability to see value in the comments of women from whom I differed most in cultural terms, had no place in the aggregation of the most prominent themes in the first phase of the analysis.

In the second part of the analysis, the emphasis on the utterance prompted me to include as valid contributions passages of talk which I had initially poorly understood and under-appreciated. Not only were these passages included, however, but the close analysis of the structure and coherence in the comments of the speakers propelled me to a deeper understanding: the dialogue, unsuccessful at first, was replayed for me in the analysis, until I could better follow, and even come to value, the unfamiliar cadences in the speech of the other.

Empathy, emotion and individual expressiveness, as central aspects of *an ethic of care*, were thus provided for in the second half of the analysis. As mentioned earlier, empathy plays only a limited role in the traditional analysis, which takes a guarded perspective vis à vis the danger of 'too much' empathy. Revealed in the second phase of the analysis is the dynamic by which empathy, at a taken-for-granted level, with RHETORICAL STYLES with which I am most comfortable and familiar, substitutes in an unexamined way for evaluation: those directors whose language inflections least resembled my own happened to be those

whose comments played the most minor role in the first half of the analysis.

I found it possible to attain a more balanced measure of empathy with the emotional displays and individual expressiveness of each speaker through complementing, and at times contrasting, my 'native' understanding with an analysis of structure. The method underlying the second part of the analysis provides a mechanism by which to re-balance the unconscious benefit given the familiar, the comfortable, the taken-for-granted, the standard, and the unmarked. In this way, the method allows for the valuation of difference, and accommodates what is perhaps the most difficult requirement of the second chapter critique, *an ethic of personal accountability*.

Second themes and the accountability of the researcher

In this phase of the analysis I have focused upon two themes, *rhetorical style* and *"positioning against"*. The former is constituted, in my usage here, by patterns of repetition, of words, phrases, or structures, which function to add drama, emphasis or prominence to a passage of speech. This repetition is accompanied by vocal intonation, and often by gestures or a change in facial expression, although I have in most cases only noted the repetition obvious in the transcribed version of speech.

The salience of *rhetorical style* first became apparent to me when I was re-transcribing interviews in order to break up the text into clauses. I did this while listening to the interviews on tape, because vocal intonation is a good indicator of where clauses begin and end, and is the only indicator of where sentences begin and end. As I started and stopped the tapes, over and over and over again, I was immersed in the rhythms of the directors' speech; some of their rhythms were more striking to me than were others. As I was working with "pp"'s tape, I thought, quite often, "This is great. *Lis*ten to that. I love it," because her style of speaking was so poetic and powerful. I caught myself at one point thinking this and realized - I had been crushingly depressed at the end of that interview, thinking I had gotten nothing out of it. Nothing "useful".

I began to wonder if this speaker's rhetorical style which, having listened to the tape so often I now was very fond of, could have been a factor in my feeling at the time that the interview was not going well. I remember thinking during the interview that this wasn't useful because our conversation was too focused on perceptions and experiences

which were too personal, on issues of social justice which were too big, on emotions which were too jagged. I remember in fact wondering just how accurate this woman's portrayal of her job could have been: she seemed kind of an emotional basket case; could she really have been as important as she made it sound? I remember this because I remember too well blushing at my own bad judgment in the dark as I waited after the interview at the bus stop while she drove by - in the full-length fur coat I had helped her into before I left, at the wheel of a late model Mercedes that matched the coat.

But it was more than a year later that I began finally to understand what it might have been about the interview which led me to feel that our conversation had been "unusable." I have since come to believe that this happened because, first, on the substantive, contextual level, I was - and to some extent still am - caught up in the myth that personal perceptions, social issues and emotions are irrelevant in theories of business. I will return to this issue below. Second, on an interpersonal level, I interpreted as "inappropriate" to the topic of business leadership a rhetorical style which was foreign to me. This style seemed kind of "preachy," holy-roller-ish, exaggerated; it was certainly, at least, "other" than a style suitable for business or for business study.

Because I worked with the taped interviews until I knew their voices intimately, and because I eventually came to see their contents not as undifferentiated torrents of talk, but, making use of clause-as-text-unit, in the form of language structures, I was able to confront the latter of these two variants of misunderstanding. What I initially heard as a style inappropriate to business I came to hear as a style which was only distinguishable to me at all because it was not a style I was accustomed to hearing. In confrontation with a rhetorical stragegy which I hear as "other", I can *hear* that the talk of the other is in fact a play to act upon me.

I know through studying language that communication is always an attempt to influence the other, through painting a certain image, through persuading, reframing, through offering, questioning or demanding. But I don't always hear these tactics as they take place, although I remain as subject to them: they occur at a level I take almost entirely for granted. I came eventually to appreciate and enjoy those rhetorical styles which were new to me, and not to hear them as attempting to influence me unduly. But I have had only partial success in being able to distinguish

rhetorical patterns and flourishes - the "art" of speaking - in speech which I hear as "normal", neutral, and unmarked[296]. It seems to me that this "art" of influence and expression must be central to the understanding of difference.

And it seems incredible to me that the other variant of misunderstanding, the propensity to hear as inappropriate references to worlds "outside" business, is a problem I should struggle with still, since it is the issue at the heart of this work and most of the work I have been involved in for the last several years. In this second phase of the analysis, I came to hear contradictions and contests between all sorts of worlds posited as different; I found this at both the representational or ideational level, and at the textual level, the level of context. This is the theme I have labelled *"positioning against"*.

This theme was most apparent to me in cases of extreme difference and of obvious sameness: those from whom I most differed tended to state up front and clearly that theirs was a view I might not have anticipated. Those for whom I felt the greatest, and most effortless, sympathy often elicited my understanding by positing themselves in contrast to the mainstream in the same way that I do. And, strangely enough, these orthogonal groups often phrased their difference in exactly the same way: "**I** come from" a culture, a place, a situation, a philosophy, or a background which makes me different. I came to see this as a theme of "positioning against" when it finally occurred to me to ask, "different from what?"

At the level of representation, it may well be impossible, or nearly so, to describe oneself without having recourse to discussions of difference. But at the textual level it is possible to reconstruct just what it is that the speaker selects to compare her- or himself to; some of the directors here turned to the "context of situation" and posited themselves as different from me. Some referred to the "context of culture" and contrasted themselves with significant others in whichever culture they found relevant: the culture of the festival industry, the culture of North America, the "dominant culture". In relating the immediate context of the speakers' talk to the broader context within which they located their respective differences, I believe one can infer the outlines of the surrounding discourse. And discourse and difference is where I started.

---

[296] Although I keep trying. An improved facility in this area would certainly make office politics easier.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter the genesis of the research question is reviewed and the results of both phases of the analysis are discussed. Conclusions are drawn from the comparison of the methods used in each of the two parts of the analysis. The implications of the methodological comparison and contrast for the study of leadership are outlined. The implications for management and for management education are also discussed. Finally, a plan is sketched for the extension of the research and refinement of the methodology.

Development of the question

At about the time I was finding that neither I nor any of the women I knew appeared in anything I read in the business school, I happened across a quotation from *Through the Looking Glass* posted on a faculty member's office door; this is, of course, the reason I am still here. I believe the quotation was the White Queen's comment about "thinking six impossible things before breakfast." My supervisor was the only woman faculty member in her department for 20 years, so she was serious about this habit, and I am fairly certain that she still keeps it up. Sometimes she picks one of the easier ones and passes it on to a student. When she suggested that I look through the literature on leadership to see if I could spot just exactly where I wasn't mentioned, and perhaps how, I grasped immediately the central impossibility of the task; I believe I protested, weakly, "You mean I would have to *read* all that stuff?"

Because I brought to this investigation a background in languages and an interest in anthropology, it is not surprising that I found most striking the viewpoints of women such as Patricia Hill Collins, whose work on Black feminist epistemology is based in part on Simmel's 'outsider within'. Or Dorothy Smith, the sociologist, quoted in the first chapter: "The subjects of sociological sentences... are male. The sociologist is a 'he'." Or Henrietta Moore, an anthropologist also quoted in the first chapter on her view of groups "muted" by structures of dominance: "if they wish to express themselves they are forced to do so through the dominant modes of expression, the dominant ideologies".

When, through the lens of feminist criticism, it appeared to me that neither women nor minority men were considered by the mainstream literature on leadership, I found it sensible to plan a qualitative study involving a group of leaders whose status was also in some ways marginal in the 'legitimate' world of business, whose status was, in anthropological terms, "liminal": their precise state is undefined or transitional; neither "fish nor fowl", festivals directors tend to be neither business persons - entirely - nor any longer 'really' artists, not 'just' activists, not 'just' administrators.

I finished the interviews and was beginning to work on, and to worry about, the first phase of the analysis. The question, I supposed, remained the same, but I was already beginning to see that the people I spoke to either sounded all the same, or focused on completely disparate things, depending on how I looked at the data. But at about that time, I came across an article about women living in Gaza which seemed to me to focus on the same nexus of power structures, language and the articulation of experience which had caught me in the first place. Sarah Roy said, at the end of her article:

> ...women in Gaza today need to be understood... by the degree to which they are still able to *imagine themselves*.[297]

I thought that this was an apocalyptic example of what I was trying to study on the privileged and mundane level of white-collar men and women at work: how do those of us whose experience is unimagined in the reigning system of discourse, the system which lays out what is sayable about leaders, for example, *imagine ourselves* as leaders?

First Themes: Reprise

In the first phase of the analysis, the approach I took to the analysis of qualitative data was based on the aggregation of recurring patterns in the data into 'themes'; those patterns which recurred most often were deemed the most worthy of investigation. These themes were inferred or interpreted from data transcribed in a format which accorded with the very vague prescription of the traditional approach that the transcription be 'accurate.' The themes thus

---

[297] Roy (1993:15), emphasis added.

elicited were presented in the analysis accompanied by the supporting evidence of 'representative excerpts' from the transcripts. These excerpts were presented in accordance with the largely unspoken but widely accepted convention in qualitative research[298] that data for public presentation be 'cleaned up,' that is, that pauses, false starts and other disfluencies which make the data difficult to read are left out.

The themes thus highlighted and presented were categorized under the headings of "Stakeholders", "(Super)Vision" and "Stages" of development of the festival organization. The primary subcategory under "Stakeholders" was that of "Volunteers". The emphasis given this category of stakeholder is congruent with the relative importance of the volunteer employee in the festival industry. In acknowledgment of the challenges of maintaining, directing and motivating an unpaid labour force, the comments of the festival directors shared an overwhelming concern for participative methods and leadership principles.

The second theme within the category of Stakeholders included the various groups of staff, board members and agencies with whom the director worked most closely. The key distinction made among those in this category of stakeholder was that of "insider/ outsider"; while the groups designated as one or the other varied from festival to festival, the majority of the directors indicated in their comments which of these types of stakeholders were truly considered "part of" and which were considered "apart from" the core organization. Each group warranted special concerns: the insiders, respect and ownership of the festival; the outsiders, special monitoring and guarded relations. The chief distinguishing feature separating outsiders from insiders, was the degree to which the stakeholders were capable of understanding the 'real' goals of the festival.

The third subcategory of Stakeholders was that which focused upon "the community" in which the festival operated and "the artist" which it showcased; because the designation of these entities was completely dependent upon the orientation of the individual festival, they were seen in important ways as the creations of the festival. Each festival director gave some attention in her or his comments to the description of the particular features of the local,

---

[298] Other than conversation analysis, which sometimes makes use of extremely close observations of detail.

municipal, national or global context which they regarded as constituting their community, and each selected, though in greater or lesser detail, a different population of artist. The definition of artist and community was a key element in the definition of the 'real' meaning of the festival.

Both the creation of artist and community as types of stakeholders and the distinction between stakeholders inside and outside of the organization were related to, and perhaps realized in, the second major theme: that of Vision, or "(Super)Vision". The vision articulated by the director was either one which was originally personally held, and which came to be shared with like-minded individuals, or one which existed prior to the director's involvement with the festival, but to which she or he became deeply committed. In either case, the vision constituted both motivation and direction, passion and goal. Goals were either linked most closely to the art form, to the festival community or to the attainment of broader social ends. This vision was seen as the festival's overarching *raison d'être* (Super Vision) but it was also seen as being especially the province of the director-as-leader (SuperVision).

The final theme elicited by the first phase of the analysis was that linking the role, and the personality, of the director to the Stage of Development of the festival. The fit between the passionate leader and the founding stage of a festival was stressed in a surprising number of accounts; a move from the need to confront and overcome obstacles to the need for participation in and broadening the sense of ownership of the festival was also widely noted. The goals or vision of the festival might be stated in almost spiritual terms, or in terms of social justice, but the implementation of those goals was most often concretized in the person and the personality of the founding or the present director.

At first glance, the most surprising result of the first phase of the analysis was the extent to which these non-traditional leaders, women and men of non-business backgrounds, directing un- or maybe dis-organizations set up to celebrate an art form or to change society through unpaid labour, resemble in their comments the standard, straight-ahead business school students, middle managers and military personnel who constitute the majority of leadership subjects in the management literature. The diversity which seemed initially to characterize this population of leaders appeared to have little impact upon the themes which characterized their comments, beyond perhaps a slightly more pronounced emphasis on art forms and social issues than one

might expect to find among students, soldiers and mid-level organizational stalwarts.

But reference back to the critique elaborated in the second chapter provided another perspective on this surprising lack of diversity: while the research design specifically located a diverse population and focused, through unstructured interviews, on the concerns of the subjects themselves, the methodology employed to analyze the interview data was inadequate to encompass or illuminate the diversity of that population or their concerns.

From First to Second Themes

The use of the second chapter critique to evaluate the first phase of the analysis was not done mechanically, as part of the original research plan: in spite of having delineated these multiple, methodological and conceptual sources of androcentrism and racism in research in some detail, I still imagined that the incorporation of difference in my own research would be accomplished by gaining access to a heterogeneous group and performing a qualitative analysis of their comments on leadership. I would use the grounded theory approach to begin with the comments of the festival directors; rather than take as the starting point the mainstream literature on leadership, I would avoid the prejudices and omissions of received wisdom by focusing on the concerns of the person speaking.

I turned to the evaluation of the first phase by means of the race and gender critique not only because I saw that race and gender had become invisible in my results - that is, because my results were looking like the 'received wisdom' that I would have liked to disconfirm. The possibility that women, and men of colour, thought, spoke and behaved exactly like their white male counterparts didn't occur to me as a new idea. What plagued me was the sensation that the tidy and 'objective' results that I was crafting were more reflective of my experience in the business school than of the comments of the festival directors. But the results looked the way I was fairly certain dissertation results were supposed to look: neat, dry, dull and vaguely disappointing - isn't that the way with objective reality, especially when it has come through the alchemical fires of scientific research? Had I really hoped for anything different? Who cared: the point was to finish.

The decision to formulate an alternative method likewise occurred to me *in medias res*, as I gradually came to believe

that maybe counting the number of times topic sentences occurred was not really more valid than paying attention to individual styles of speaking. As I sifted through the words of the directors I regularly stopped to ponder the structure of their comments - but how could I include these esoteric bits? They were too unique, too personal, their interest and appeal requiring too much detailed explanation. And even if I found a way to explain what these verbal minuets and arabesques meant to me, the relation between what a speaker said and how she or he said it was ambiguous and didn't seem in any way to contribute to what is known about leadership - the ostensible point of all this. I tried for a long time to steel myself against the allure of these structural eccentricities, which seemed to glitter against what was increasingly becoming the barren landscape of the transcribed interviews.

I finally turned to the evaluation, by reference to the critique, of what would thereafter be the first phase of the analysis with the attitude "Try this or walk downstairs and get another coffee?" It took about two minutes to begin a different dissertation. Of course the results seemed generic. According to the premises set by my own critique, I had done exactly what most "diversity" research does: I had inserted race and gender as a couple of additional variables. I had perhaps posed a critical question, but then had listened uncritically for the response, imagining, as white feminists have done for so long, that my being female would be enough to enable me to appreciate difference when I saw it. Of course race and gender had become invisible in the analysis; once the interviews were transcribed, I incorporated race and gender inclusiveness, as delineated in the critique, only in my good intentions and fondest hopes, and not specifically in the methodology. Of course I would have to begin again if I were to acknowledge that the initial analysis did not accord well with my own concrete experience of the interviews, making up a different method as I went along. But even if the result would be less a contribution to what is known than a questioning of it, I should at least be able to address in depth, and illustrate in practice, the nine questions I had posed.

In order to answer the questions of the critique, I have ended up *positioning* the second phase of the analysis *against* what has become the traditional qualitative approach; in order to explain why and how I did this, I have ultimately done a dissertation which positions itself against a traditional piece of research. As in the second

phase of the analysis, the dynamic inherent to "positioning against" locates the utterance in relation to the surrounding discourse; this dissertation is an utterance which locates itself by contrast with the expectation of a dissertation.

As the work evolved, I felt at first obliged by the attention to voice in the method itself, and then encouraged by my committee's reaction to the work, to locate myself in the research: this has led to the incursion in the work of a *rhetorical style* which may appear to some incongruous, or incompatible with 'rigour.' This particular incongruity can be easily defended in terms of the feminist and Black feminist critique; in the academy as in any public space voices in a higher pitch have always called attention to themselves and caused undue concern. As to rigour, insofar as I can treat the word without smirking, the method detailed in the second phase of the analysis has been demonstrated to be more capable, not less, of withstanding scrutiny than traditional approaches to qualitative research. And I would maintain that rigour as it effects the voice of the researcher has traditionally acted less as a guarantor of value than as a screen to personal accountability. As it does in the second phase of the analysis, rhetorical style in this dissertation locates the reader as surely as it does the writer, to the extent that it becomes salient in the reader's perception of the utterance.

Leadership and Language Theory

The primary conclusion which must be drawn from this research is that studies of leadership which take a naïve view of language produce naïve theory, theory which is non-critical and which obscures the workings of difference. The perspective on leadership revealed in each part of the analysis is dependent on the perspective on language assumed by the underlying methodology. In the first phase of the analysis, the underlying theory sees language as freely employed and as effective in the degree to which it achieves a shared ideal; the correspondent results in leadership research see differences in the understanding of leadership as individual deviations around a mean. In the second phase of the analysis, language is seen as composed of a limited number of socially sanctioned and standardized forms, the combination and enunciation of which is elastic; measurement of effectiveness is replaced by the analysis of functions which work to create meaning on multiple levels. The

correspondent results in leadership research project an ability to analyse diversity in function rather than to measure effectiveness against a standard.

Implications for the Study of Leadership

I say that the results of leadership research based on a critical theory of language "project" this ability because in the present research results in terms of leadership are far more limited than are the results in terms of the methodology constructed to find those results. The implications of the themes discussed in the second part of the analysis, however, provide clear indications for further studies of leadership, both within the realm of the present population of leaders and in the broader range of leadership studies.

In the analysis of the utterances which responded to the question "Do you think of yourself as a leader" the speakers could be seen to position themselves within or against various general discourses which intersect in the discourse of leadership: an academic discourse, for example, in which the actions and reactions of daily life are abstracted to a rational mechanics; a discourse of business in which cost/benefit calculations possess infinite potential; a discourse of reason shared by both of the former, in which passion is conceived as a contaminant; a discourse of a greater good, whether that be civic, artistic, or political. That these general references implied in most cases some relation to the speaker's conception of my frame of reference, as listener, should be noted.

The more specific contexts the speakers chose to position themselves against indicate specific aspects of the discourse of leadership they felt to be pertinent or to prevail. The following table encapsulates the specific references made through "positioning against" in the excerpts analyzed in Chapter 6.

Table 4

SPEAKER	*POSITION AGAINST*
cc	• a more experienced leader
qq	• a leader in a colonizing culture (as opposed to a colonized culture) • those who set out to become a leader • men who lead • those who lead for status/selfishness

ii	•a philosophy which makes only one person the leader/accepts a single authority figure
oo	•the kind of leadership which gives orders •leadership which is disrespectful, which acts as a push or a shove •collective leadership models which don't work •collective leadership models which rely too heavily on consensus (as opposed to collaboration) •"being a leader" (rather than "taking leadership") - "Cause it requires that everyone else is followers"
ll	•the other directors I talked to (in terms of confidence in one's ability to run things)
dd	•those who come from a traditional point of view (as opposed to the point of view of the arts) •those who don't believe that people will live up to one's expectations if given the opportunity
pp	•the one who is up front •the one whose name you would see in the publicity material
mm	•those who confuse leadership with power
nn	•leadership where there is a hierarchy and there is not a sense of team responsibility
gg	•the leader who does not lead out of pure enjoyment •the leader who does not lead for the good of the community
kk	•the leader who is less politically anarchistic
hh	•leaders who get top heavy and are concerned only for the two or three lieutenants around them
ee	•a large and bureaucratic parent organization

aa	•the dominant culture (as a member of the '60's counter culture) •prevailing laws, attitudes or norms •people, institutions or governments who regard his vision/passion as crazy or impractical or impossible •a prescribed academic methodology of leadership
ff	•those who do not come from a business/engineering background •those who do not treat a festival as a business

The usefulness of this information is limited: the references listed here are discrete, contradictory, idiosyncratic, even at times cryptic. But the value of such a listing is in making obvious the preliminary yet fertile nature of the work I have done so far. The logical next step is to return to the full transcripts and to extract from each speaker's account other instances of "positioning against". The outlines of the discourse of leadership to which each speaker refers can first be expanded and then compared across accounts: will individual speakers be consistent in their references to an assumed standard of leadership against which they position themselves? Will there be regularities in what is imagined as a shared understanding of leadership across accounts? Will there be differences corresponding to the race or gender of the speaker? Will the outlines of what is posited as a shared understanding vary with different populations?

The expansion of the study of rhetorical style in the interviews with the festival directors will be accomplished in the same way, through retrieving and analysing additional instances which seem to me, as listener, to make use in a marked way of repetition, mode, enunciation, or stress. The attempt to isolate the aspects of a speaker's voice which one hears as particularly 'other' is complex and rewarding: it is complex because what one hears as different says at least as much about the listener as about the speaker. In this way the implication - personal, social, intellectual, emotional - of the listener/ researcher in the analysis is made explicit and is itself subject to analysis. It is rewarding in the way that listening to new music or learning a new language is rewarding: one can achieve understanding where understanding was difficult or impossible; one can find connection where, in the initial confrontation with an

unfamiliar style, there was the disheartening and alienating experience of failed communication.

The attempt to incorporate difference in the study of leadership has in the main been unsuccessful. Our inability to escape traditional forms and categories can be located in an inability to conceptualize the limitations of both the substance and the style of the reigning discourse. A critical conception of language underpinning an expanded emphasis on qualitative leadership studies would further the conceptualization of both the impact of an unspoken understanding of leadership upon those who don't look or sound like the traditional leader, and of approaches to leadership which depart from this repressive understanding.

Implications for Management and for Management Education

I find two things most disheartening when I turn away from research long enough to consider who is sitting in my classroom: the uniformly pale complexion of my students and the reports that the number of women in business education continues to decline at the MBA level. These latter reports have been contested, but I know that I have never taught a class at any level in which the women outnumber the men. And even in the management seminars I have taught within the Toronto city limits, women and men of colour are in an extreme minority.

I believe that the school where I teach takes the situation of its women students and its very few minority men about as seriously as most - which is to say that virtually all faculty will agree that discrimination on the basis of gender or race is unacceptable. The vast majority, of course, would argue that it isn't a problem here. And most prevalent is the attitude which says "Discrimination is unacceptable BUT you can't ask me to incorporate this women in management/ diversity stuff in my courses because I don't know anything about it." I have thus far refrained from asking if I would have gotten the job had I claimed not to know anything about men in management.

I believe that attention to the language with which leadership is taught, developed and evaluated might enable teachers and managers to escape the bias against difference which now prevails and which seems so difficult for the majority to see. And in the absence of a sympathetic understanding, a stronger sense of how language structures impact upon what is said might enable women and minority men to insist at least upon more sympathetic language: the "Master Manager" program at my university's business

institute, for example, might find itself renamed, whether or not the men and women who teach it find the name personally offensive.

Perhaps more important than attention paid to the names of courses and the textbook descriptions of leadership would be an increased understanding of the potential for failed communication in confrontation with diverse rhetorical styles. The boundless importance accorded all things global has had a less than revolutionary impact on the study of foreign languages; an appreciation for the complexities of understanding variants of one's own language, while never accorded much value, has been eclipsed. In a time of radical diversity in the workforce an emphasis on communication and barriers to communication should be paramount.

The complete dearth of a theoretical basis for the language aspect of management studies indicates to me an abounding need to clarify the questions asked in research on leadership, the method of analyzing qualitative data, the language used to convey results to the academic and business communities, and to the students who need to move between both worlds. The discourses institutionalized in language and language style have a direct impact on hiring, training and promotion decisions; an improved ability to analyze language and language styles as these are tied to images of leadership has the potential to make difference more comprehensible, more valued, and more functional in the workplace.

Extension of the Research and Refinement of the Method

The work of coding the transcripts for other instances in each speaker's account of "positioning against" is finished; that of locating the moments in which the rhetorical style of the speaker becomes, from my perspective, salient is also complete. While the task of compiling and examining these structures is what I plan to accomplish next, I look forward to the chance to move to interviews with other populations: women in executive positions, women entrepreneurs, groups with a majority of women and men of colour, and a group or two of all white men. If the work alone didn't draw me onward, the chance to silence the question which has most plagued me would; I have been asked "Do you have a control group?" so often that I find it nearly impossible to force myself to formulate an answer. If I hadn't believed in standard utterances before,

the example of this one question would have convinced me utterly.

As I believe the example of the analysis of the McShane text demonstrates, there is productive ground for close linguistic analyses of texts, management tools and executive development programs, especially as these are being used in application to diverse populations. In addition to heterogeneous student and organizational populations in North America, non-western management trainees in global organizations form a group whose relation to the unstated ideals in western leadership discourse is interesting.

Apart from the use of close linguistic analysis of other texts and in relation to other populations, the refinement of the method itself constitutes an avenue of investigation which I find alluring. I have begun an exploration of the use of computer software with functional analysis; while I am not a believer in the ability of software programs to manage grammatical analyses, the search, retrieval, storage, sorting, indexing and reporting capacity of programs currently available could enhance the this kind of analysis immeasurably.

In terms of the refinement to that aspect of the method which is strictly grammatical, I foresee as the next logical step the development of a detailed checklist to assist in the analysis of each metafunction, breaking down, for example key structures with which meaning is created at each level; in this I would continue to follow Halliday's functional grammar. Finally, I would like to attempt the combination of an analysis of metafunction with the analysis of narrative structures, specifically through finding the correspondence between the functional grammatic concepts of texture and coherence and theories of the mechanics of narrative conventions. I believe that this combination of approaches to text has the potential to greatly expand the power of each to illuminate difference as difference informs the relation between speaker and listener.

Coda

Difference also informs the relation between self and discourse. Here too the illumination of difference through attention to language can vastly improve the relationship. I know I'm happier. And so, having practiced all this time thinking about impossible things, I will end with a slightly more optimistic image of woman as Other, journeying and practicing thinking about impossible things:

"... There's glory for you!"

"I don't know what you mean by 'glory,'" Alice said.

Humpty Dumpty smiled contemptuously. "Of course you don't till I tell you. I meant 'there's a nice knockdown argument for you.'"

"But 'glory' doesn't mean 'a nice knockdown argument,'" Alice objected.

"When *I* use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean - neither more nor less."

"The question is," said Alice, "whether you *can* make words mean so many different things."

"The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master - that's all."

Alice was too much puzzled to say anything, so, after a minute, Humpty Dumpty began again. "They've a temper, some of them - particularly verbs, they're the proudest: adjectives you can do anything with, but not verbs. However, *I* can manage the whole lot of them! Impenetrability! That's what *I* say!"

"Would you tell me, please," said Alice, "what that means?"

"Now you talk like a reasonable child," said Humpty Dumpty, looking very much pleased, "I meant by 'impenetrability' that we've had enough of that subject and it would be just as well if you'd mention what you mean to do next, as I suppose you don't mean to stop here all the rest of your life."[299]

---

[299] L. Carroll (1946/72:229-230)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alvesson, M. 1985. A critical framework for organizational analysis. *Organization Studies*, 6 (2):117-138.

Alvesson, M., & Billing, Y. 1992. Gender and organization: Towards a differentiated understanding. *Organization Studies*, 13 (12):73-102.

Antaki, C. 1988. *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Astley, W. G. 1985. Administrative science as socially constructed truth. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30: 497-513.

Baker, T.L. 1988. *Doing Social Research*. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1977. *Le Marxisme et la Philosophie du Langage*. Paris: Minuit.

Bakhtin, M.M. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Emerson, C. & Holquist, M., (Eds.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barnes, L. B., & Kriger, M. P. 1986. The hidden side of organizational leadership. *Sloan Management Review*, Fall: 15-25.

Bass, B. M. 1985. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. 1988. Evolving perspectives on charismatic leadership. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*: 40-77. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bass, B.M. 1990. *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Applications*, 3rd Edition. NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Goodheim, L. 1987. Biography and assessment of transformational leadership at the world class level. *Journal of Management*, 13: 7-20.

Bell, E.L., Denton, T.C., & Nkomo, S. 1993. Women of color in management: Toward an inclusive analysis. In E.A. Fagenson, (Ed.), *Women in Management: Trends, Issues, and Challenges in Managerial Diversity*: 105-130. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality*. Middlesex, England: Penguin.

Bordo, S. 1990. Feminism, postmodernism, and gender-scepticism. In L. J. Nicholson (ed), *Feminism/Postmodernism*. NY: Routledge.

Bouchard, T.J., Jr., Barsaloux, J., & Drauden, G. 1974. Brainstorming procedure, group size, and sex as determinants of problem-solving effectiveness of groups and individuals. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59:135-138.

Brenner, O., Tomkiewicz, J., & Schein, V. 1989. The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics revisited. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32:

Brenner, O., Tomkiewicz, J., & Stevens, G. 1991. The relationship between attitudes toward women and attitudes toward Blacks in management positions. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 8: 102-107.

Brown, R. H. 1978. Bureaucracy as praxis: Toward a political phenomenology of formal organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23:365-382.

Bruce, D. 1992. *Discourse analysis: Principles and applications*. Paper presented at the University of Alberta.

Burns, J. M. 1978. *Leadership*. NY: Harper & Row.

Calás, M. B., Jacobson, S., Jacques, R., & Smircich, L. 1990. *The X in Y: Gendering McGregor's discourse of control*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, San Francisco, California.

Calás, M.B. & Smircich, L. 1991. Voicing seduction to silence leadership. *Organization Studies*, 12/4:567-602.

Calasso, R. 1993. *The Marriage of Cadmus and Harmony*. NY: Knopf.

Carroll, S.J. Jr., & Gillen, D.J. 1987. Are the classical management functions useful in describing managerial work? *Academy of Management Review*, 12:38-51.

Chodorow, N. 1978. *The Reproduction of Mothering*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clegg, S. 1981. Organization and control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26:545-562.

Clegg, S. 1989. Radical revisions: Power, discipline and organizations. *Organization Studies*. 10(1):97-115.

Coch, L. & French, J.R. P. 1948. Overcoming resistance to change. *Human Relations*, 1:512-532.

Collins, P. H. 1986. Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social Problems*, 33 (6): S14-S32.

Collins, P. H. 1989. The social construction of Black feminist thought. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 14 (4): 745-773.

Collins, P. H. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. London: Harper Collins.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. 1987. Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12: 637-647.

Cotton, J. L., Vollrath, D. A., Froggatt, K. L., Leng-Hall, M. L., & Jennings, K. R. 1988. Employee participation: Diverse forms and different outcomes. *Academy of Management Review*, 13: 8-22.

Crouch, A. & Yetton, P. 1987. Manager behavior, leadership style, and subordinate performance: An empirical extension of the Vroom-Yetton conflict rule. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 39: 384-396.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. 1975. A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership in formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13: 46-78.

Davis, A. Y. 1981. *Women, Race and Class*. NY: Random House.

Day, D. V. & Lord, R. G. 1988. Executive leadership and organizational performance. *Journal of Management*, 14 (3): 453-464.

de Beauvoir, S. 1970. *The Second Sex*. NY: Knopf.

Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. 1994. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Derrida, J. 1976. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

De Vos, G. A. 1973. *Socialization for Achievement: Essays on the Cultural Psychology of the Japanese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Duchon, D., Green, S. G., & Taber, T. D. 1986. Vertical dyad linkage: A longitudinal assessment of antecedents, measures, and consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 56-60.

Eagly, A., & Johnson, B. 1990. Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108:233-256.

Eagly, A., & Karau, S. 1991. Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60:685-710.

Eagly, A., Makhijani, M. & Klonsky, B. 1992. Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111 (1):3-22.

Eddy, E. & Partridge, W. 1978. *Applied Anthropology in America*. NY: Columbia University Press.

Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989. Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review* 14(4): 532-550.

Ely, R. 1994. The effects of organizational demographics and social identity on relationships ampng professional women. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39:203-238.

Esquivel, L. 1992. *Like Water for Chocolate*. NY: Doubleday.

Ettling, J. T., & Jago, A. G. 1988. Participation under conditions of conflict: More on the validity of the Vroom-Yetton model. *Journal of Management Studies*, 25: 73-83.

Ferguson, K. E. 1984. *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fiedler, F. E. 1967. *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Fisher, B.M. & Edwards, J.E. 1988. Consideration and initiating structure and their relationships with leader effectiveness: A meta-analysis. *Best Papers Proceedings, Academy of Management*, Anaheim, CA, 201-205.

Foucault, M. 1970. Las meniñas. In *The Order of Things*. London:Tavistock.

Foucault, M. 1971. Orders of discourse. *Social Science Information*, 10(2): 7-30.

Foucault, M. 1976. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Harper & Row.

Foucault, M. 1980a. *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, *An Introduction*. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. 1980b. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Colin Gordon (Ed.). NY: Pantheon.

Freedman, S. M., & Phillips, J. S. 1988. The changing nature of research on women at work. *Journal of Management*, 14 (2): 231-251.

French, J.R.P., Israel, J., & Aas, D. 1960. An experiment on participation in a Norwegian factory. *Human Relations*, 13:3-19.

French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. H. 1959. The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies of Social Power*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Gallupe, R.B., Bastianutti, L.M., & Cooper, W.H. 1991. Unblocking brainstorms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76:137-142.

Gavey, N. 1989. Feminist poststructuralism and discourse analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 13:459-475.

Giddens, A. 1974. *Positivism and Sociology*. London: Heinemann.

Gilkes, C. 1981. From slavery to social welfare: Racism and the control of Black women. In A. Smerdlow & H. Lessinger (Eds.), *Class, Race, and Sex: The Dynamics of Control*. Boston: G.K.Hall.

Gilligan, C. 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theroy and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. NY: Aldine.

Goodenough, W. 1978. Multiculturalism as the normal human experience. In E. Eddy & W. Partridge (Eds.), *Applied Anthropology in America*. NY: Columbia University Press.

Graen, G.B., Scandura, T. A., & Graen, M. R. 1986. A field experimental test of the moderating effects of growth need strength on productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 484-491.

Graen, G.B., & Wakabayashi, M. 1994. Cross-cultural leadership-making: Bridging American and Japanese diversity for team advantage. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 4(2nd ed.):415-446. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Greiner, L.E. 1972. Evolution and revolution as organizations grow. *Harvard Business Review*, 50(4):37-46.

Gwaltney, J. 1981. Common sense and science: Urban core black observations. In D. Messerschmidt (Ed.), *Anthropologists at Home in North America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Habermas, J. 1971. *Knowledge and Human Interests*. London: Heinemann.

Haberman, J. 1974. *Theory and Practice*. London: Heinemann.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. 1976. Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16: 250-279.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hammer, T. H., & Turk, J. M. 1981. Organizational determinants of leader behavior and authority. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72: 674-682.

Haraway, D. 1989. *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science*. NY: Routledge.

Hardesty, S. & Jacobs, N. 1986. *Success and Betrayal: The Crisis of Women in Corporate America*. NY: Simon & Schuster.

Harding, S. 1986a. The curious coincidence of feminine and African moralities. In E. Kittay & D. Meyers (eds.) *Women and Morality*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allenheld.

Harding, S. 1986b. *The Science Question in Feminism*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Harding, S. 1987. Is there a feminist method? In S. Harding (Ed.), *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press

Hare-Mustin, R. T. & Marecek, J. 1988. The meaning of difference: Gender theory, postmodernism, and psychology. *American Psychologist* 43 (6): 455-464.

Hartsock, N. 1990. Foucault on power: A theory for women? In L. Nicholson (ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism*. NY: Routledge.

Hearn, J. & Parkin, P. W. 1983. Gender and organizations: A selective review and a critique of a neglected area. *Organization Studies*, 4 (3): 219-242.

Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., Simon, M. C., & Martell, R. F. 1989. Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women and managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74 (6): 935-942.

Hennig, M. & Jardim, A. 1976. *The Managerial Woman*. NY: Doubleday.

Herriott, R.E. & Firestone, W.A. 1983. Multisite qualitative policy research: Optimizing description and generalizability. *Educational Researcher*, 12(2): 14-19.

Hicks, G. & Handler, M. 1978. Ethnicity, public policy, and anthropologists. In E. Eddy & W. Partridge (Eds.), *Applied Anthropology in America*. NY: Columbia University Press.

Horton, R. 1967. African traditional thought and Western science. *Africa*, 37: 50-71, 155-187.

House, R. J. 1971. A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16: 321-338.

House, R. J. 1977. A 1976 charismatic theory of leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J., Woycke, J., & Fodor, E. M. 1988. Charismatic and non charismatic leaders: Differences in behavior and effectiveness. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*: 231-236. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howell, J. M., & Frost, P. 1989. A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43 (2): 243-269.

Hurtado, A. 1989. Relating to privilege: Seduction and rejection in the subordination of white women and women of color. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 14(4): 833-855.

Jacques, R. 1992. Critique and theory building: Producing knowledge "from the kitchen." *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3): 582-606.

Janesick, V.J. 1994. The dance of qualitative research design: Metaphor, methodolatry, and meaning. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S., (Eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 209-219.

Janeway, E. 1975. On the power of the weak. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 1 (1): 103-109.

Jefferson, G. 1979. Sequential aspects of stroytelling in conversation. In *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, Schenkein, J., (Ed.). NY: Academic Press, 219-248.

Kanter, R. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. NY: Basic Books.

Keller, E.F. 1983. *A Feeling for the Organism*. San Francisco: Freeman.

Keller, E.F. 1985. *Reflections on Gender and Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kerr, S., & Slocum, J.W., Jr. 1987. Managing corporate culture through reward systems. *Academy of Management Executive*, 1(2): 99-108.

Kets de Vries, M.F.R. 1994. The leadership mystique. *Academy of Management Executive*, 8(3): 73-89.

King, M. 1973. The politics of sexual stereotypes. *Black Scholar*, 4: 12-23.

King, L., Dixon, V., & Nobles, W. 1976. *African Philosophy: Assumptions & Paradigms for Research on Black Persons*. Los Angeles: Charles R. Drew Postgraduate Medical School, Fanon Center Publication.

Kochman, T. 1981. *Black and White Styles in Conflict*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Komaki, J. 1986. Toward effective supervision: An operant analysis and comparison of managers at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 270-278.

Komaki, J. L., Zlotnick, S., & Jensen, M. 1986. Development of an operant-based taxonomy and observational index of supervisory behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 260-269.

Kress, G. 1985. Ideological structures in discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, v. 4: 27-41.

Kuhn, T. S. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. 1987. Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12: 648-657.

Labov, W. 1972. *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lafferty, J. C., Eady, P. M., & Elmers, B. A. 1973. *The Desert Survival Problem Manual*. Plymouth, Mich.: Experimental Learning Methods.

Leana, C. R. 1986. Predictors and consequences of delegation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29: 754-774.

McShane, S.L. 1992. *Canadian Organizational Behaviour*. Homewood, IL.: Irwin.

Maller, J.B. 1925. Cooperation and competition: An experimental study in motivation. *Teachers College Contributions to Education*, No. 384.

Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P., Jr. 1987. Leading workers to lead themselves: The external leadership of self-managing work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32: 106-128.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. 1989. *Designing Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Martin, J. 1990. *Rethinking Weber: A feminist search for alternatives to bureaucracy*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, San Franciso, California.

McHugh, M. C., Koeske, R. D., & Frieze I. H. 1986. Issues to consider in conducting nonsexist psychological research: A guide for researchers. *American Psychologist*, 41 (8): 879-890.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83 (2): 340-363.

Michaels, S. 1981. 'Sharing time': Children's narrative styles and differential access to literacy. *Language and Society*, 1: 423-442.

Michaels & Cazden, C. 1986. Teacher-child collaboration as oral preparation for literacy. In *Acquisition of Literacy: Ethnographic Perspectives*. Schieffelin, B.B., (Ed.). Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 132-154.

Miller, K. I., & Monge, P. R. 1986. Participation, satisfaction, and productivity: A meta-analytic review. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29: 727-753.

Millman, M. & Kanter, R. M. (Eds.). 1975. *Another Voice: Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science*. Garden City, NY: Anchor/Doubleday.

Mills, A. J. 1988. Organization, gender and culture. *Organization Studies*, 9 (3): 351-369.

Mintzberg, H. 1973. *The Nature of Mangerial Work*. NY: Harper & Row.

Mishler, E.G. 1991. Representing discourse: The rhetoric of transcription. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 1(4):255-280.

Moore, H. 1988. *Feminism and Anthropology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Morrison, A. M. & Von Glinow, M. A. 1990. Women and minorities in management. *American Psychologist*, 45 (2): 200-208.

Mulder, M., DeJong, R. D., Koppelaar, L., & Verhage, J. 1986. Power, situation, and leaders' effectiveness: An organizational study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 566-570.

Nkomo, S. 1992. The emperor has no clothes: Rewriting "race in organizations". *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3): 487-513.

Nye, A. 1988. *Feminist Theory and the Philosophies of Man*. NY: Routledge.

Olian, J. D., Schwab, D.P., & Haberfeld, Y. 1988. The impact of applicant gender compared to qualifications on hiring recommendations: A meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 41:180-195.

Ouchi, W. 1981. *Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Partridge, W., & Eddy, E. 1978. The development of applied anthropology in America. In E. Eddy & W. Partridge (Eds.), *Applied Anthropology in America*. NY: Columbia University Press.

Payne, C. 1989. Ella Baker and models of social change. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* (14)4: 885-899.

Pfeffer, J., & Davis-Blake, A. 1986. Administrative succession and organizational performance: How administrator experience moderates the succession effect. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29: 72-83.

Phillips, A.S., & Bedeian, A.G. 1994. Leader-follower exchange quality: The role of personal and interpersonal attributes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4): 990-1001.

Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. 1987. *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.

Quinn, R.E. & Cameron, K. 1983. Organizational life cycles and shifting criteria of effectiveness: Some preliminary evidence. *Management Science*, 29:33-51.

Rabinow, P. 1975. *Symbolic Domination: Cultural Form and Historical Change in Morocco*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reinharz, S. 1984. *On Becoming a Social Scientist*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Reissman, C.K. 1987. When gender is not enough: Women interviewing women. *Gender & Society*, 1: 172-207.

Reissman, C.K. 1988. Worlds of difference: Contrasting experience in marriage and narrative style. In *Gender and Discourse: The Power of Talk*. Todd, A.D. and Fisher, S., (Eds.). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Reissman, C.K. 1993. *Narrative Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rorty, R. 1979. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rose, H. 1983. Hand, brain & heart: A feminist epistemology for the natural sciences. *Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 9 (1):73-90.

Roy, S. 1993. Black milk. *The Women's Review of Books*, July, vol. X (10-11):15.

Russell, K. K. 1987. Growing up with privilege and prejudice. *New York Times Magazine*, June 14:22-28.

Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. NY: Random.

Sayer, D. 1987. *The Violence of Abstraction: Analytic Foundations of Historical Materialism*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Scandura, T. A., Graen, G. B., & Novak, M. A. 1986. When managers decide not to decide autocratically: An investigation of leader-member exchange and decision influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 579-584.

Schein, V. E. 1973. The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57: 95-100.

Schein, V. E. 1975. Relations between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60: 340-344.

Schwandt, T.A. & Halpern, E.S. 1988. *Linking Auditing and Metaevaluation: Enhancing quality in Applied Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Scott, J. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Smith, D. 1974. Women's perspective as a radical critique of sociology. *Sociological Inquiry*, 44 (1): 7-13.

Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L. 1969. *The Measurment of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Spelman, E. V. 1988. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. Boston: Beacon.

Stack, C. 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. NY: Harper.

Stack, C. 1986. The culture of gender: Women and men of color. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12(3): 321-324.

Stake, R.E. 1994. Case studies. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S., (Eds.) . Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 236-247.

Steinem, G. 1992/93. *Revolution From Within: A Book of Self-Esteem*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Stogdill, R. & Coons, A. 1957. *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement* (Research Monograph No. 88). Columbus: Ohio State University.

Stoppard, T. 1968. *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*. NY: Grove Press.

Strauss, A.L. 1987. *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. 1994. Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S., (Eds.) . Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 273-285.

Sutton, C.D., & Moore, K. K. 1985. Executive women - 20 years later. *Harvard Business Review*, 42-66.

Sydie, R. A. 1987. *Natural Women, Cultured Men: A Feminist Perspective on Sociological Theory*. Toronto: Methuen.

Thomas, A. B. 1988. Does leadership make a difference to organizational performance? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33: 388-400.

Turner, Patricia A. 1994. *Ceramic Uncles and Celluloid Mammies: Black Images and Their Influence on Culture*. NY: Anchor Books.

van Dijk, T. A. 1985. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, v. 1-4. London: Academic Press.

Van Seters, D. A., & Field, R. 1990. The evolution of leadership theory. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 3(3), 29-45.*

Vecchio, R. P. 1987. Situational leadership theory: An examination of a prescriptive theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72: 444-451.

Vroom, V.H., & Jago, A.G. 1988. *The New Leadership: Managing Participation in Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. 1973. *Leadership and Decision-making*. Pittsburg: University of Pitsburg Press.

Wagner, J. A., & Gooding, R. Z. 1987. Shared influence and organizational behavior: A metanalysis of situational variables expected to moderate participation-outcome relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30: 524-541.

Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., & Einstein, W. O. 1987. Leadership and outcomes of performance appraisal processes. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60: 177-186.

Weber, M. 1947. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Weedon, C. 1987. *Feminist Practice & Poststructuralist Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Wellman, D. T. 1977. *Portraits of White Racism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wetherell, M. & Potter, J. 1988. Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative repertoires. In Antaki, Charles (Ed.), *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Whorf, B.L. 1959. *Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings*, J.B. Carroll (Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Technology Press of MIT.

Williams, P. J. 1991. *The Alchemy of Race and Rights: Diary of a Law Professor*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Yin, R. 1981. The case study crisis: Some answers. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 26: 58-65.

Yin, R. 1984. *Case Study Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Yukl, G. 1989. Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15 (2): 251-289.